

THE
NATIONAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

EDWARD I. SEARS, LL. D.

VOL. XVII. No. XXXIII. JUNE, 1868.

Pulchrum est bene facere reipublice, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est.

NEW YORK:

EDWARD I. SEARS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,

61 BROADWAY.

GENERAL AGENTS:

NEW YORK: AMERICAN NEWS CO., 121 NASSAU STREET. BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & Co.,
100 WASHINGTON STREET. PHILADELPHIA: JAMES K. SIMON, SOUTH
SIXTH STREET. LONDON: TRUBNER & CO., 60 PATERNOSTER
ROW. PARIS: VICTOR ALEXI, 19 RUE DU MAIL.

1868.

STEINWAY & SONS

TRIUMPHANT

AT THE

UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION,

PARIS, 1867.



STEINWAY & SONS,

Have been awarded the

FIRST GRAND GOLD MEDAL,

For American Pianos in all Three Styles Exhibited, viz., Grand, Square, and Upright, this Medal being **DISTINCTLY CLASSIFIED FIRST IN ORDER OF MERIT**, and

placed at the head of the List of all Exhibitors, in proof of which the following

OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE

Of the President and members of the International Jury on Musical Instruments (Class X) is subjoined:

"I certify that the **FIRST GOLD MEDAL** for American Pianos has been unanimously awarded to **MESSRS. STEINWAY** by the Jury of the International Exhibition. First on the List in Class X.

"MILINET, President of International Jury.

GEORGES KASTNER,	} Members of the International Jury."
AMBROISE THOMAS,	
ED. HANSLICK,	
F. E. GEVAERT,	
J. SCHEIDMEYER,	

This unanimous decision of the International Class Jury, *indorsed* by the Supreme Group Jury, and *affirmed* by the Imperial Commission, being the *final verdict* of the *only tribunal* determining the rank of the awards at the Exposition, places *The Steinway Pianos* at the head of all others, in competition with over **Four Hundred Pianos** entered by the most celebrated European and American manufacturers.



DEVLIN & CO.

EXTENSIVE

Clothing Houses,

Broadway, cor. of Grand St.,

AND

Broadway, cor. of Warren St.,

NEW YORK,

COMPRISING ALL BRANCHES OF THE BUSINESS AS REPRESENTED IN THE

Custom & Ready-Made Departments

OF

MEN'S, BOYS' & CHILDREN'S

CLOTHING.

SHIRTS

Of the Celebrated American Yoke Pattern,

WITH

Gentlemen's Furnishing Goods

OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

WE HAVE ALSO

A SPECIAL DEPARTMENT

FOR GETTING UP IN THE BEST MANNER AND BY REGULATION
ALL KINDS OF

MILITARY, NAVAL, CLERICAL,
LIVERY, DIPLOMATIC, & COURT DRESSES.

DEVLIN & CO.

KNICKERBOCKER Life Insurance Company,

OF THE

CITY OF NEW YORK.

ERASTUS LYMAN,
*President.*GEORGE F. SNIFFEN,
Secretary.

Assets nearly	-	-	-	-	-	\$3,500,000
Annual Income for 1867	-	-	-	-	-	2,050,000
Policies issued in 1867-10,283.						
Total Amount issued, over	-	-	-	-	-	\$50,000,000

POLICIES ISSUED FROM \$1,000 TO \$25,000
On a Single Life.

Every Desirable Form of Policy Issued.

New and Original Features Introduced by this Company in 1866.

NO RESTRICTIONS IN POLICIES AS TO TRAVEL OR RESIDENCE
IN ANY PART OF THE CIVILIZED SETTLEMENTS OF THE
UNITED STATES.

FREE PERMITS TO EUROPE.

No Extra Charge for Army and Navy Officers.

NO EXTRA CHARGE FOR CAPTAINS AND OFFICERS OF FIRST-CLASS STEAMSHIPS
AND SAILING VESSELS SAILING FROM PORTS OF THE
UNITED STATES AND EUROPE.

No Extra Charge for Railroad Conductors, &c.,

AND MANY OTHER ADVANTAGES NOT OFFERED OR ALLOWED BY OTHER
COMPANIES.

APPROVED SCHOOL-BOOKS,

PUBLISHED BY

E. H. BUTLER & COMPANY,

No. 137 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

Mitchell's New School Geographies.

MITCHELL'S FIRST LESSONS IN GEOGRAPHY. For young children. Designed as an introduction to the Author's Primary Geography. With maps and engravings.

MITCHELL'S NEW PRIMARY GEOGRAPHY. Illustrated by Twenty Colored Maps. One Hundred Engravings. Designed as an introduction to the New Intermediate Geography.

MITCHELL'S NEW INTERMEDIATE GEOGRAPHY. For the use of Schools and Academies. Illustrated by Twenty-three Copper-Plate Maps, and numerous Engravings.

MITCHELL'S NEW SCHOOL GEOGRAPHY AND ATLAS. A System of Modern Geography—Physical, Political, and Descriptive; accompanied by a new Atlas of Forty-four Copper-Plate Maps, and illustrated by Two Hundred Engravings.

MITCHELL'S NEW PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY, with Thirteen Copper-Plate Maps, and One Hundred and Fifty Engravings. By JOHN BROCKLEBURY, A. M., Professor of Mathematics in Trinity College.

MITCHELL'S NEW OUTLINE MAPS. A series of Seven Maps, handsomely colored and mounted, in size 24 by 28 inches, except the Map of the United States, which is 28 by 48 inches. They clearly and fully represent, at a glance, the Political Boundaries, Mountain Systems, River Courses, Plateaus, Plains, and Deserts of the Earth.

MITCHELL'S NEW ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY. An entirely new work, elegantly illustrated.

Goodrich's Series of School Histories.

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. A Pictorial History of the United States, with notices of other portions of America. By S. G. GOODRICH, author of "Peter Parley's Tales."

GOODRICH'S AMERICAN CHILD'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. An introduction to the author's "Pictorial History of the United States."

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. A Pictorial History of England. By S. G. GOODRICH.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF ROME. A Pictorial History of Rome, with sketches of the History of Modern Italy.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF GREECE. A Pictorial History of Greece, Ancient and Modern.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF FRANCE. A Pictorial History of France. Revised and improved edition, brought down to the present time.

GOODRICH'S PARLEY'S COMMON-SCHOOL HISTORY OF THE WORLD. A Pictorial History of the World, Ancient and Modern. By S. G. GOODRICH, author of "Pictorial History of the United States," etc.

Teachers and Boards of Education are respectfully invited to address the Publishers, as above, for further information regarding these Books, all of which are eminently suitable for the School-room.

GOODRICH'S PICTORIAL NATURAL HISTORY. Elegantly illustrated with more than Two Hundred Engravings.

BINGHAM'S LATIN GRAMMAR. A Grammar of the Latin Language. For the use of Schools. With exercises and vocabularies. By WILLIAM BINGHAM, A. M., Superintendent of the Bingham School.

BINGHAM'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR. A Grammar of the English Language. For the use of Schools and Academies. With copious parsing sentences. By WILLIAM BINGHAM, A. M.

COPPEE'S ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. Designed as a Manual of Instruction. By HENRY COPPEE, LL. D., President of Lehigh University.

COPPEE'S ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC. Designed as a Manual of Instruction.

COPPEE'S ACADEMIC SPEAKER. Containing a large number of new and appropriate Pieces for Prose Declamation, Poetical Recitation, and Dramatic Reading, carefully selected from the best authors, American, English, and Continental.

FLEMING & TIERBINE'S FRENCH DICTIONARY. An entirely new and complete French and English, and English and French Dictionary, adapted to the present state of the two Languages, 1,400 pages, royal 8vo, fine sheep.

FLEMING & TIERBINE'S FRENCH DICTIONARY. Abridged. One vol. 12mo, 724 pages.

HART'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR. A Grammar of the English Language. By JOHN S. HART, LL. D.

HART'S CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. A brief Exposition of the Constitution of the United States. In the form of Questions and Answers.

HOWE'S PRIMARY LADIES' READER. A choice and varied Collection of Prose and Poetry, adapted to the capacity of Young Children. By JOHN W. S. HOWE, Professor of Education.

HOWE'S JUNIOR LADIES' READER.

HOWE'S LADIES' READER.

HOWE'S LADIES' BOOK OF READING AND RECITATIONS.

SMITH'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR. English Grammar on the Productive System. By EDWARD C. SMITH.

SCHOLAR'S COMPANION. Containing Exercises in Orthography, Derivation, and Classification of English Words. New Revised Edition. By KUTUS W. BAILEY.

STOCKHARDT'S CHEMISTRY. The Principles of Chemistry, illustrated by simple experiment. By DR. JULIUS ADOLPH STOCKHARDT, Professor of the Royal Academy of Agriculture at Tharand. Translated by Professor C. H. PIERCE of Harvard College.

TENNEY'S GEOLOGY. Geology for Teachers, Classes, and Private Students. By SAMUEL TENNEY, A. M., Professor of Natural History in Vassar Female College. Illustrated with Two Hundred Engravings.

THE
EQUITABLE
Life Assurance Society

Of the United States,

No. 92 Broadway, New York.

WM. C. ALEXANDER,
President.

HENRY B. HYDE,
Vice-President.

GEORGE W. PHILLIPS,
Actuary.

JAMES W. ALEXANDER,
Secretary.

Cash Assets,	- - - -	\$6,000,000
Annual Premium Income,	-	4,000,000

ITS PROGRESS IS UNPARALLELED.

Sum Assured in 1867 (new business) Over \$45,000,000.

ITS POLICIES AVERAGE THE LARGEST
Of Any American Company.

IT ISSUES ALL DESIRABLE NON-FORFEITING POLICIES

On a Single Life, from \$250 to \$25,000.


All Profits Divided among Policy-Holders.

DIVIDENDS MADE ANNUALLY FROM THE START.

This is the most successful Company ever organized, and for its years,

THE LARGEST MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.
IN THE WORLD.

Its percentage of total "Out-go" to "Cash Premium Receipts" was shown by the last official Report of the New York Insurance Superintendent, to be less than that of any other Company whatever.

 To secure a Policy in the Equitable, apply at the Office, No. 92 Broadway, N. Y., or to any of the Society's Agents throughout the United States.

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE EXERCISES WILL BE RESUMED AS FOLLOWS:

IN THE SCHOOL OF ART,

September 4.

PREPARATORY SCHOOL,

September 11.

IN THE

DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND LETTERS

AND

SCHOOL OF CIVIL ENGINEERING,

September 20.

THE SCHOOL OF LAW,

October 2.

THE SCHOOL OF ANALYTICAL AND PRACTICAL
CHEMISTRY,

AND THE

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

October 17.

Examinations for admission to the Department of Science and Letters will take place in the Council Room on TUESDAY, September 19, at 9½, A. M.

For Circulars, inquire at the University, Washington Square.

ISAAC FERRIS,

September, 1868.

Chancellor.

THE
National Life Insurance Company
 OF
NEW YORK.

NO. 212 BROADWAY,
 CORNER OF FULTON STREET. (KNOX BUILDING.)

ASSETS JANUARY 1, 1868, - - - \$292,388 41.

Dividend to Policy-holders 50 per cent.

SPECIAL ADVANTAGES

OFFERED TO

Insurers in the National Life Insurance Company.

All Policies non-forfeiting after two years.

All Policies incontestible after five years.

Note taken for one-half the annual premium.

No interest charged on semi-annual or quarterly premiums.

Thirty days' grace allowed in payment of premiums.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

S. M. BEARD,
 S. C. HERRING,
 HENRY CLEWS,
 J. A. ISELIN,
 S. T. TRUSLOW,
 ROBERT CROWLEY,
 WM. E. PRINCE,
 T. B. VAN BUREN,
 ELI BEARD,

HECTOR TOULMIN,
 W. A. CUMMINGS,
 J. O. HALSEY,
 E. A. JONES,
 H. J. RAYMOND,
 J. C. DIMMICK,
 J. E. DOW,
 HOWELL SMITH,
 F. H. LUMMUS,

H. P. FREEMAN,
 JOSEPH WILDE,
 CHARLES CURTIS,
 A. WRIGHT, M. D.,
 WATSON SANFORD,
 W. H. WORTHINGTON,
 O. M. BEACH.

OFFICERS:

EDWARD A. JONES,
 President.

JONATHAN O. HALSEY,
 Vice-President.

JOHN A. MORTIMORE, Secretary.

JOHN C. DIMMICK, *Attorney and Counsel.*

HIRAM B. WHITE, M. D., *Medical Examiner.*

Residence, No. 5 Green Avenue, near Fulton Avenue, Brooklyn.—At office daily from
 2 to 3 o'clock, P. M.

University of Notre Dame,

ST. JOSEPH CO., IND.

This Institution, incorporated in 1844, enlarged in 1866, and fitted up with all the modern improvements, affords accommodation to five hundred Students. Situated near the M. S. & N. I. R. R., it is of easy access from all parts of the United States.

TERMS:

Matriculation Fee.....	\$5 00
Board, Bed and Bedding, and Tuition (Latin and Greek included); Washing and Mending of Linens; Doctor's Fees and Medicine, add attendance in sickness, per Session of five months.....	150 00
French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Hebrew, each....	10 00
Instrumental Music.....	12 50
Use of Piano.....	10 00
Use of Violin.....	2 00
Drawing	10 00
Use of Philosophical and Chemical Apparatus.....	5 00
Graduation Fee	10 00
Students who spend their summer vacation at the College are charged extra.....	35 00

PAYMENTS TO BE MADE INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

Class Books, Stationery, &c., furnished at Current Prices.

The first Session begins on the first Tuesday of September, the second on the first of February.

For further particulars, address

REV. W. CORBY, C. S. C., President.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

Manhattan Life Insurance Company, OF NEW YORK, Nos. 156 and 158 Broadway, JANUARY 1, 1868.

RECEIPTS DURING THE YEAR 1867.

For Premiums, Extra Premiums, &c.....	\$1,094,095 14
For Interest and Rents.....	242,268 91
For Interest and Rents accrued.....	42,096 13
	<u>\$1,979,860 18</u>

DISBURSEMENTS.

Paid Claims by death on Policies and Bonus, and Payment of Annuities.....	\$400,181 75
Paid Expenses, Salaries, Taxes, Revenue Stamps, Medical Examiner's Fees, Commission, &c.....	257,725 83
Paid Dividends, Re-Insurance, Purchased Policies and Bonus, Interest on Dividends, &c.....	295,697 60
	<u>\$953,604 67</u>

ASSETS.

Cash in Bank and on hand.....	\$ 53,016 07
Bond and Mortgages.....	880,255 00
Loans on Policies in force.....	1,707,428 42
[The actuarial estimates of the value of the Policies which secure these Notes is about \$2,101,500.]	
United States and New York State Stocks.....	719,753 20
Quarterly and Semi-annual premiums deferred, and Premiums and Interest in course of collection and transmission.....	506,799 63
Temporary Loans on Stocks and Bonds.....	380,425 00
[Market value of the Securities, \$489,567 00.]	
Interest accrued to date and all other property.....	52,096 63
	<u>\$4,891,778 45</u>

ADVANTAGES TO INSURERS:

Smallest Ratio of Mortality.
 Expenses less than any Cash Company.
 Liberal Modes of payment of Premiums.
 Insurers receive the largest bonus ever given.
 Dividends made Annually on all Participating Policies.
 No claims Unpaid.
 All kinds of Non-Forfeiting Life and Endowment Policies issued.
 Policies incontestible.
 All Endowment Policies and the Non-Forfeiting Life Policies Non-Forfeitable after one Payment.

The following are examples of the operations of the last dividend:

POLICIES ISSUED IN 1863, ONLY FOUR YEARS AGO.

Age at Issue.	Amount Insured.	Premium Paid.	Added to Policy.	Total Amount Policy.
40	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,280	\$ 3,572	\$ 13,572
55	8,000	1,092	2,348	10,543
80	7,500	704	2,703	10,208
25	7,000	571	2,505	9,505

This is an entirely new plan, giving Insurers the largest return ever made by any Company in the same period.

HENRY STOKES, President.

C. Y. WEMPLE, Vice-President.
 S. N. STEBBINS, Actuary.

J. L. HALSEY, Secretary.
 H. Y. WEMPLE, Ass't Secretary.

CONTENTS OF ALL THE NUMBERS
OF THE
NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OF WHICH COPIES CAN BE FURNISHED.

CONTENTS OF No. III.

December, 1860.

- I.—Lord Bacon.
- II.—American Female Novelists.
- III.—Camoens and His Translators.
- IV.—England under the Stuarts.
- V.—Tendencies of Modern Thought.

- VI.—A Glance at the Turkish Empire.
- VII.—The Greek Tragic Drama—Sophocles.
- VIII.—French Romances and American Morals.
- IX.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. IV.

March, 1861.

- I.—Persian Poetry.
- II.—Americanisms.
- III.—Mexican Antiquities.
- IV.—Modern Criticisms.
- V.—Popular Botany.

- VI.—The Saracenic Civilization in Spain.
- VII.—Motley's United Netherlands.
- VIII.—The Lessons of Revolutions.
- IX.—Quackery and the Quacked.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. V.

June, 1861.

- I.—Ancient Civilization of the Hindoos.
- II.—The Jesuits and their Founder.
- III.—Jeremy Bentham and His Theory of Legislation.
- IV.—Greek Comic Drama—Aristophanes.
- V.—Recent French Literature.
- VI.—The Canadas, their Position and Destiny.

- VII.—The Sciences among the Ancients and Moderns.
- VIII.—Danish and Swedish Poetry.
- IX.—The Secession Rebellion; why it must be put down.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. VI.

September, 1861.

- I.—The Poetical Literature of Spain.
- II.—Hans Christian Andersen and His Fairy Legends.
- III.—Influence of Music—The Opera.
- IV.—The De Saussures and their Writings—Mme. Necker.
- V.—Mahomet and the Koran.

- VI.—Wills and Will Making. [ence.
- VII.—Aristotle—His Life, Labors, and Influence.
- VIII.—Carthage and the Carthaginians.
- IX.—Spasmodic Literature—Philip Thaxter.
- X.—The Secession Rebellion and its Sympathizers.
- IX.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. VII.

December, 1861.

- I.—The Men and Women of Homer.
- II.—Fallacies of Buckle's Theory of Civilization.
- III.—Burial Customs and Obituary Lore.
- IV.—Modern Italian Literature.
- V.—Necessity for a General Bankrupt Law.

- VI.—Russia on the Way to India.
- VII.—Berkeley—His Life and Writings.
- VIII.—Count De Cavour.
- IX.—The Morals of Trade.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. VIII.

March, 1862.

- I.—Vindication of the Celts.
- II.—Dr. Arnold of Rugby.
- III.—Female Education; Good, Bad, and Indifferent.
- IV.—Christopher Martin Wieland.
- V.—Improvements and New Uses of Coal Gas.

- VI.—Bombastic Literature.
- VII.—Influence of Comparative Philology on Intellectual Development.
- VIII.—Our National Defenses.
- IX.—The Union, not a League, but a Permanent Government.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. IX.

June, 1862.

- I.—The Chinese Language and Literature.
- II.—Angelology and Demonology, Ancient and Modern.
- III.—Sir Thomas More and his Times.
- IV.—Maud as a Representative Poem.
- V.—The Comedies of Molière.
- VI.—Education and Unity of the Pursuit of the Christian Ministry

- VII.—Sir Philip Sidney.
- VIII.—Aurora Leigh.
- IX.—Yellow Fever a Worse Enemy to Civilizations than to Soldiers.
- X.—The National Academy of Design and its Great Men.
- XI.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. X.

September, 1862.

- I.—Lucretius on the Nature of Things.
- II.—The Works and Influence of Goethe.
- III.—Madame de Maintenon and her Times.
- IV.—Effects of War and Speculation on Currency.
- V.—Sacred Poetry of the Middle Ages.
- VI.—The Laws and Ethics of War.
- VII.—New Theories and New Discoveries in Natural History.
- VIII.—Poland—Causes and Consequences of Her Fall.
- IX.—Quackery of Insurance Companies.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XI.

December, 1862.

- I.—The Arts and Sciences among the Ancient Egyptians.
- II.—New England Individualism.
- III.—Genius, Talent and Tact.
- IV.—Ought our Great Atlantic Cities be Fortified.
- V.—The Writings and Loves of Robert Burns.
- VI.—André and Arnold.
- VII.—Bacon as an Essayist.
- VIII.—Publishers, Good, Bad, and Indifferent.
- IX.—Direct and Indirect Taxation at Home and Abroad.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XII.

March, 1863.

- I.—The Works and Influence of Schiller.
- II.—Astronomical Theories.
- III.—Culture of the Human Voice.
- IV.—Lucien and his Times.
- V.—Electro-Magnetism and Kindred Sciences.
- VI.—Orators and Eloquence.
- VII.—Insurance Quackery and its Organs.
- VIII.—Charlemagne and his Times.
- IX.—James Sheridan Knowles.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XIII.

June, 1863.

- I.—The Greek Tragic Drama—Æschylus.
- II.—Theology of the American Indians.
- III.—Photographic Short-Hand.
- IV.—Arabic Language and Literature.
- V.—Earthquakes—Their Causes and Consequences.
- VI.—Manhattan College.
- VII.—Woman—Her Influence and Capabilities.
- VIII.—Peruvian Antiquities.
- IX.—Manufacture and Use of Artificial Precious Stones.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XIV.

September, 1863.

- I.—The Insane and their Treatment, Past and Present.
- II.—The Clubs of London.
- III.—Cowper and his Writings.
- IV.—Fendalism and Chivalry.
- V.—Meteors.
- VI.—Spuriousness and Charlatanism of Phrenology.
- VII.—The Public Schools of New York.
- VIII.—Ancient Scandinavia and its Inhabitants.
- IX.—Social Condition of Working Classes in England.
- X.—Commencements of Colleges, Seminaries, &c.
- XI.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XV.

December, 1863.

- I.—Prison Discipline, Past and Present.
- II.—Richard Brinsley Sheridan.
- III.—Influence of the Medici.
- IV.—Girard College and its Founder.
- V.—Modern Civilization.
- VI.—Laplace and his Discoveries.
- VII.—The House of Hapsburg.
- VIII.—The Mexicans and their Revolutions, from Iturbide to Maximilian.
- IX.—The Gypsies, their History and Character.
- X.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XVI.

March, 1864.

- I.—Sources and Characteristics of Hindoo Civilization.
- II.—Juvenal on the Decadence of Rome.
- III.—The Brazilian Empire.
- IV.—Castille and his Conspiracy.
- V.—Klopstock as a Lyric and Epic Poet.
- VI.—Our Quack Doctors and their Performances.
- VII.—Kepler and His Discoveries.
- VIII.—Ancient and Modern Belief in a Future Life.
- IX.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XVII.

June, 1864.

- I.—Pythagoras and His Philosophy.
- II.—History and Resources of Maryland.
- III.—Russian Literature, Past and Present.
- IV.—Cemeteries and Modes of Burial, Ancient and Modern.
- V.—College of the Holy Cross.
- VI.—Leibnitz as a Philosopher and Discoverer.
- VII.—The Negro and the White Man in Africa.
- VIII.—Our Presidents and Governors compared to Kings and Petty Princes.
- IX.—Notices and Criticisms.

CONTENTS OF No. XVIII.

September, 1864.

- | | |
|---|---|
| I.—Chemistry, its History, Progress, and Utility. | VI.—Spinoza and His Philosophy. |
| II.—Vico's Philosophy of History. | VII.—Commencements of Colleges, Universities, &c. |
| III.—Elizabeth and Her Courtiers. | VIII.—Emigration as Influenced by the War. |
| IV.—Do the Lower Animals Reason? | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—William Pitt and His Times. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XIX.

December, 1864.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| I.—Pericles and His Times. | VI.—Leo X. and His Times. |
| II.—The Civilizing Forces. | VII.—Chemical Analysis by Spectral Observations. |
| III.—Chief-Justice Taney. | VIII.—The President's Message. |
| IV.—Spanish Literature—Lope de Vega. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Currency—Causes of Depreciation. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XX.

March, 1865.

- | | |
|--|---|
| I.—Italian Poetry—Ariosto. | VI.—Machiavelli and His Maxims of Government. |
| II.—Lunar Phenomena. | VII.—History, Uses and Abuses of Petroleum. |
| III.—Grahame of Claverhouse and the Covenanters. | VIII.—Swedenborg and His New Religion. |
| IV.—Our Gas Monopolies. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Edward Everett. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXI.

June, 1865.

- | | |
|---|---|
| I.—The Celtic Druids. | VI.—Modern Correctors of the Bible. |
| II.—Wallenstein. | VII.—Ancient and Modern Discoveries in Medical Science. |
| III.—United States Banking System—Past and Present. | VIII.—The Lessons and Results of the Rebellion. |
| IV.—The New York Bar—Charles O'Connor. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Phases of English Statesmanship. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXII.

September, 1865.

- | | |
|--|---|
| I.—Lord Derby's Translation of Homer. | VI.—The National Debt of the United States. |
| II.—William Von Humboldt as a Comparative Philologist. | VII.—The Civilization of the Ancient Persians. |
| III.—The Wits of the Reign of Queen Anne. | VIII.—Commencements of Colleges and Seminaries. |
| V.—American Female Criminals. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| IV.—The Negative Character of Cicero. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXIII.

December, 1865.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| I.—Authenticity of Ossian's Poems. | VI.—Lord Palmerston. |
| II.—Daniel Webster and His Influence. | VII.—Museums and Botanical Gardens. |
| III.—The Symbolism of the Edias. | VIII.—The President's Message. |
| IV.—Character and Destiny of the Negro. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Epidemics and their Causes. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXIV.

March, 1866.

- | | |
|---|---|
| I.—Galileo and His Discoveries. | V.—The President's Veto—Rights of Congress. |
| II.—Australia, its Progress and Destiny. | VI.—Lessing and his Works. |
| III.—International Courtesy—Mr. Bancroft's Oration. | VII.—Pain and Anæsthetics. |
| IV.—Sydney Smith and His Associates. | VIII.—British Rule in Ireland. |
| | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |

CONTENTS OF No. XXV.

June, 1866.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| I.—Socrates and His Philosophy. | VI.—The South American Republics and the Monroe Doctrine. |
| II.—The Saturnian System. | VII.—The Greek Tragic Drama—Sophocles. |
| III.—Heine and his Works. | VIII.—Partisan Reconstruction. |
| IV.—Why the Opera fails in New York. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Buddhism and its Influence. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXVI.

September, 1866.

- | | |
|--|---|
| I.—The Julius Caesar of Napoleon III. | VI.—Irish Law and Lawyers. |
| II.—The Philosophy of Death. | VII.—Sample of Modern Philosophy. |
| III.—Arabian Civilization, and What We Owe It. | VIII.—The National Convention and its Work. |
| IV.—Newton and His Discoveries. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Our Colleges and Our Churchmen. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXVII.

December, 1866.

- | | |
|--|---|
| I.—Physiology and the Lesson it Teaches. | V.—Hungary, her Literature and her Prospects. |
| II.—Cuba, its Resources and Destiny. | VI.—Indecent Publications. |
| III.—Robert Boyle; his Influence on Science and Liberal Ideas. | VII.—Education in Congress. |
| IV.—Food and its Preparation. | VIII.—Notices and Criticisms. |

CONTENTS OF No. XXVIII.

March, 1867.

- | | |
|--|---|
| I.—Alfieri, his Life, Writings, and Influence. | VI.—Negro Rule in Hayti and the Lessons it Teaches. |
| II.—Oliver Cromwell, his Character and Government. | VII.—The Sun and its Distance from the Earth. |
| III.—The Temporal Power of the Pope. | VIII.—Insurance, Good, Bad, and Indifferent. |
| IV.—Chatterton and His Works. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Poisons and Poisoners. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXIX.

June, 1867.

- | | |
|--|--|
| I.—The Ancient Phenicians, and their Civilization. | VI.—Fichte and His Philosophy. |
| II.—Ornithology of North America. | VII.—What the Politicians make of our Postal System. |
| III.—Origin of Alphabetic Writing. | VIII.—Euler and his Discoveries. |
| IV.—Virgil and his New Translator. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—Release of Jefferson Davis vs. Military Domination. | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXX.

September, 1867.

- | | |
|---|---|
| I.—The Jews and their Persecutions. | VI.—Assassination and Lawlessness in the United States. |
| II.—Have the Lower Animals Souls or Reason? | VII.—The Jesuits in North America and Elsewhere. |
| III.—Winkelman and Ancient Art. | VIII.—The Civil Service in the United States. |
| IV.—Dante and his new Translator. | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |
| V.—What has Bacon Originated or Discovered? | |

CONTENTS OF No. XXXI.

December, 1867.

- | | |
|--|--|
| I.—Greek Comedy—Menander. | V.—Nebular Astronomy. |
| II.—Animal Magnetism; its History, Character, and Tendency. | VI.—Martin Luther and the Old Church. |
| III.—Management of our Finances; Ruinous Influence of Paper Money. | VII.—Mediaeval German Literature—Eichenbach. |
| IV.—Lafayette as a Patriot and Soldier. | VIII.—Heraldry; its Origin and Influence. |
| | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |

CONTENTS OF No. XXXII.

March, 1868.

- | | |
|---|--|
| I.—Epicurus and his Philosophy. | V.—The Venetian Republic and its Council of Ten. |
| II.—English Newspapers and Printing in the Seventeenth Century. | VI.—Progress made by American Astronomers. |
| III.—Progress and Influence of Sanatory Science. | VII.—Supernatural Phenomena. |
| IV.—The Microscope and its Discoveries. | VIII.—Impeachment of the President. |
| | IX.—Notices and Criticisms. |

The Leading Democratic Journal of Pennsylvania.

"THE AGE."

Great Improvements and Great Inducements!

THE UNION AND THE CONSTITUTION.

As Low-priced as the Cheapest—Equalled by Few—Excelled by None!

A first-class Newspaper, containing the very latest intelligence from all parts of the world, and the only Democratic Morning Journal published in Philadelphia. Advertisers will find it a desirable medium for giving publicity to their cards, as **THE AGE** has a larger mail list and reaches a class who subscribe for no other paper.

Published every morning (except Sundays), at No. 430 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

TERMS:

DAILY AGE.

\$9.00 per annum. \$4.50 for six months. \$2.50 for three months.

THE WEEKLY AGE.

A complete Compendium of the News of the Week. Adapted to the wants of the Politician, the Farmer, the Merchant, the Mechanic, the Family Circle, and the General Reader.

READ OUR TERMS.

ONE COPY, ONE YEAR.....	\$2.00
FIVE COPIES.....	9.00
TEN COPIES.....	17.50
TWENTY COPIES.....	33.00

The following deductions from the above rates, will be made when *all the papers* ordered are sent to a *single address*, and not addressed severally to the members of the club:

FIVE COPIES, ONE YEAR.....	\$8.50
TEN COPIES.....	16.50
TWENTY COPIES.....	30.00

One copy will be furnished gratis for getting up a club of ten, or more, to one address, for one year.

Address all orders to

WELSH & ROBB, Proprietors,

No. 430 Chestnut Street,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Rutgers Female College,

487, 489 & 491 FIFTH AVENUE,

NEW YORK CITY.

THIS INSTITUTION, which has enjoyed a high and wide reputation ever since its foundation in 1838, has now received from the Legislature of the State of New York a regular College Charter. The aim and purpose of the President and Trustees will now be to raise the standard of Ladies' education, and to afford the best facilities for acquiring a thorough and complete training, not only in those studies and accomplishments which are generally comprised in female education, but also in the classics and physical sciences; in short, to bring the course of study as nearly as possible to the level of that of our young men's colleges.

With this view, provision has been made for the pursuit of the Greek, Latin, German, and French Languages. The classical course is made optional after the close of the Sophomore year, so that pupils desirous of pursuing more fully other branches, either in modern languages or natural science, may have the opportunity of doing so.

The Fine Arts form a separate and independent department of study, under the personal charge of Mr. F. B. CARPENTER, and the supervision of Mr. HUNTINGTON, President of the National Academy of Design. Drawing in outline forms part of the regular course, but painting in oil or water colors is not included, and is to be prosecuted by special studies.

Physiology, and several allied branches, are to be formed into the Department of Home Philosophy, the aim of which shall be to teach, on the widest scale possible in such institution, the applications of science to the conduct of every-day life.

In conformity with the plan in the OLD RUTGERS INSTITUTE, the COLLEGE will still maintain an Academic and a Preparatory School, at which children and young girls may study under the same system and influences as those of the COLLEGE itself.

The Terms in the Preparatory Department are \$100 per year; in the Academic \$150, and in the College \$200, with the exception of the Senior year, when the expenses of graduation are added to the annual rate, so as to make it \$250.

For further information, application may be made in person or by letter to

HENRY M. PIERCE, LL.D., President.

ST. VINCENT'S
Collegiate and Theological
SEMINARY,
St. Vincent's P. O., Westmoreland County,
PENNSYLVANIA.

This institution, under the direction of the Fathers of the Order of St. Benedict, is situated in the western part of Pennsylvania, eight miles from Greensburgh, and forty-one from Pittsburg, and rendered easily accessible from all parts of the United States by the Pennsylvania Central Railroad passing through its lands. The location is elevated and healthy, commanding an extensive and magnificent view of the surrounding country. The buildings, having been lately enlarged, can accommodate two hundred and twenty-five students.

The courses of studies established in the College are—the ecclesiastical, the classical, and commercial, besides an elementary school for beginners.

TERMS:

Tuition, board, bedding, washing and mending of linen, per session of five months.....	\$90 00
Entrance Fee.....	5 00
Tuition in Chemistry and Natural Philosophy.....	8 00
Tuition in French, Spanish, and Italian, each.....	10 00
Tuition in Drawing and Painting.....	9 00
Vacation, when spent at the College.....	28 00
Music at Professor's charges.	

The academic year commences on the first Monday of September, and ends about the first of July.

For further information or catalogues, address,

REV. ALPHONSE HEIMLER, O. S. B.,
President.

B. L. SOLOMON & SONS,

657 & 659 BROADWAY,

OPPOSITE BOND STREET,

NEW YORK.

KEEP ALWAYS ON HAND A LARGE STOCK OF

CURTAIN GOODS,

Cornices, Trimmings, &c., &c.,

HOUSE-KEEPING LINENS,

Furniture Coverings,

PIER AND MANTEL GLASSES,

Paper Hangings,

From the cheapest to the most elaborate imported.

All work done by best artists, and orders promptly attended to.

THE
NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. XXXIII.

JUNE, 1868.

- ART. I.—1. *Annæi Senecæ, tum Rhetoris, tum Philosophi, Opera omnia*, ab ANDREA SCHOTTO. Geneva, 1625.
2. *Caligula, Claudius, and Nero*. DION CASSIUS.
3. *De Senecæ, Vita et Scriptis*. REINHART. Jena, 1817.
4. *Abrégé de la vie et des œuvres de Sénèque*. Paris, 1812.
5. *De la Morale Pratique dans les Lettres de Sénèque*. Par MARTHA. Strasbourg, 1854.
6. *Etude Critique sur les rapports supposés entre Sénèque et Saint Paul*. Par AUBERTIN. Paris, 1857.

It is no mere poetical adage that "the proper study of mankind is man;" no study is more useful or more interesting. There are but few men, however, who will reward our toil; the shallow and thoughtless yield us as little as the barren heath. In order that we may learn from man, he must possess some element of greatness; he must be a thinker before he can teach us to think. In proportion as he possesses thoughts and has the faculty to communicate them, he exercises an influence upon us for good or evil according to the nature of those thoughts. Fortunately it is but rarely the higher class of minds attempt to inculcate evil; men of true genius generally encourage virtue, even when their own practices are vicious.

In order to appreciate this to its full extent, it is necessary to bear in mind that the greatest thinkers are frequently guilty of the gravest errors; and that there is scarcely one of the most illustrious benefactors of mankind whose character would prove entirely faultless on a close examination. It is only the thoughtless, therefore,

who expect any one to be perfect; men of sense admire and value what is good, and attribute the evil which accompanies it to human frailty. Those who pursue the opposite course do justice to none; nor are any more ready to pass a severe judgment on the errors of others than those who commit the gravest errors themselves.

These thoughts have been suggested to us by an examination of the life and writings of Seneca, the Roman philosopher and moralist, than whom none among the illustrious dead has been more rudely assailed by a certain class of modern writers. That the tutor of Nero was guilty of serious errors far be it from us to deny. We have no intention of eulogizing his moral character; nor shall we seek to justify a single fault that may be regarded as proved against him. Our main object, in the present article, is to show that, assuming the worst accusations made against Seneca, by his enemies, to be true, the good he has done by his writings not only entitles him to acquittal at the hands of posterity, but also to a high rank among the instructors of mankind.

There is no period in the life of Lucius Annæus Seneca which does not possess a peculiar interest; born in the second or third year of the Christian era, there are few heroes of romance whose story is more chequered. Both his paternal and maternal ancestors were distinguished for superior intellect and intelligence. His father, Marcus Annæus, as well as himself, was a native of Corduba, in Spain. The former took no part in politics. Belonging, as he did, to the equestrian order, and possessing an ample fortune, he could easily have secured a prominent position in the State, but he preferred to devote his life to literature and oratory. With this view he visited Rome when about the age of twenty, B. C. 41. His first care was to place himself under the tuition of Marillius, the most eminent rhetorician of his time; and he also availed himself of the instructions of Porsius Latro, another rhetorician who disputed the palm of excellence with Marillius. Having studied some three years under these teachers, he returned to Corduba, and married a Spanish lady named Helvia, who was generally admired for her beauty, virtue, and accomplishments.

Marcus Annæus had three sons by this marriage, each of whom became illustrious. The first was Marcus Novatus, the proconsul of Achaia, before whom St. Paul was accused of corrupting the religion of the State, and whose enlightened liberality protected the apostle from

the vindictive bigotry of his enemies;* the second was the philosopher, the subject of the present article; the third, Lucius Annæus Mela, whose greatest honour, according to Tacitus, was to be the father of the poet Lucan, author of the *Pharsalia*, who was also born in Spain.

Marcus Annæus was the author of several works, but only two are extant; one, *Controversiarum*, lib. X.; the other *Suasorum liber*. Even these have reached our time only in a mutilated state. As the father and son were warmly attached to each other in life, so their works are now generally found in the same volumes. In the edition now before us, the fragments of the elder Seneca begin the first volume; although none of them are equal to any of the works of the philosopher. The younger Seneca never forgot that his best instructions were those he received from his father, who, although he could well afford to employ the most eminent tutors, preferred to be his first teacher himself; and in order to present him an additional incentive to study, he received other young lads into his family to be instructed with him.

We shall see as we proceed how grateful the philosopher was for this affectionate solicitude. When a child, Seneca was so delicate and feeble that few believed he could live, but the assiduous care of his mother and paternal aunt saved him. Nor did he merely owe the preservation of his life to these good women; he always admitted that he was indebted to them for the best precepts to be found in his ethics. He also tells us, that when in adversity, he was often prevented from committing suicide, by his affection for his parents, knowing that his death would overwhelm them with grief. But thoroughly educated as Marcus Annæus was, he would not allow his son to rely on his instructions alone; he placed him, in turn, under the tuition of Sextius and Attalus; the philosopher himself bears interesting testimony to the fact. "While I was yet a child," he says, "I sat at the school of Sotion."

Seneca confined himself to no sect in philosophy, but studied the doctrines of all, although he always avowed a preference for those of the Stoics. His favourite studies were the works of Metronax, Fabianus Papirius, and Demetrius, the cynic. Scarcely any writers or thinkers differed more from each other than these; but Seneca took delight in comparing their precepts and dogmas, adopting such

* Etude critique sur les rapports supposés entre Sénèque et St. Paul.

as he approved, and rejecting such as seemed absurd or chimerical, and whatever may be said of his conduct in after life, and especially when he was the tutor and adviser of Nero, it is certain that in his youth his practices were in accordance with his precepts. He tells us that he had not heard the lectures of Sotion, the Pythagorean, more than two or three times, before he determined to discontinue the use of animal food. We are not informed whether he experienced any diminution of physical strength from the change; but he writes on the subject to his friend Lucilius: "My soul has become lighter and more agile."*

That his body became somewhat lighter, also, we may infer from the course pursued by his father, who blamed him severely for adopting extreme views, and reminded him of many illustrious men who were not the less wise, or the less virtuous, for having used animal food in moderation. In order to strengthen this argument, Marcus Annaeus reminded his son of the edict recently issued by Tiberius, expelling the Jews and Egyptians from Rome on account of their religion, one of the chief characteristics of which was abstinence from certain kinds of animal food. Young Seneca had at this time, become so much attached to Rome, that the idea of having to leave it frightened him. He resumed the use of animal food; but it is certain that he retained a dislike to it until the day of his death. Even when he had more wealth than perhaps any other private citizen, it is admitted by his enemies that he was always frugal in his mode of living.

His father was not willing that he should devote himself wholly to philosophy; he told him that it was not for this purpose he had taken so much pains in having him instructed in oratory. Upon the other hand young Seneca yearned to be a philosopher of the first rank; but he finally yielded to the wishes of his father, and studied law. He soon became distinguished as an advocate; although we have no reason to believe that he was an orator of the first class, many facts related by his contemporaries show that few of his time excelled him in eloquence. It is well known that Caligula had great pretensions to the persuasive art, and that none pleased him better than those who compared him to Cicero. None deny that the tyrant was a fluent and elegant speaker;

* Ep. ad Lucil. cviii.

and all admit that he was jealous of the oratoric fame of Seneca. The fact is recorded by Suetonius; but he says that the emperor sought no other weapon against his rival, than a disdainful raillery, such as the following: "His harangues," said Caligula, "are but academic morsels; they are but sand without lime." That the emperor tried to disparage his oratory in this manner is highly probable; but that his jealousy led him no further is denied by almost every other biographer who takes any notice of the circumstance. Thus for example, Dio Cassius informs us, that such was the envy of Caligula, on having heard Seneca plead an important case before the senate, that he resolved to put him to death, and that he spared him only at the earnest request of one of his concubines, who assured him that the fatal disease, under which all knew he laboured,* would kill him soon, adding that it was more judicious to allow him to die of phthisis than to put to death one who could not be accused of any capital offence.

Whether the tyrant was induced to spare his life on this account or not, it is certain that the health of Seneca was very precarious at this period. He suffered severely from hectic fever, which made him almost a skeleton. In describing his condition to his mother some time subsequently, he says: "More than once I had the temptation to put an end to my days. The thought of my old father, who could not support such a blow, restrained me. I commanded myself to live. Sometimes it requires courage to support even life."†

It seems that, whatever resolution was formed by Caligula, Seneca thought it best to retire from public life for some time. He asked permission from the emperor to travel, knowing that the latter would be gratified at his departure, and still more gratified if he thought he would never return. Be this as it may, he soon set out for Egypt, where his maternal uncle was prefect. His chief object was to learn all he could in a country where the most eminent of the Greek philosophers had so far extended the sphere of their knowledge; and it is sufficiently evident from his writings that he was a close observer and zealous investigator during his stay in Egypt. It does not appear that he wrote any work while in that country, but he collected a large mass of materials, which

* Ep. lxxviii.

† Cons. ad Helviam, xvii.

he afterwards turned to good account in his works on Superstition and Earthquakes, and in his *Questiones Naturales*; although his work on Superstition is known at the present day only by some quotations made from it by St. Augustin, and by a brief mention of it by Tertullian.

Soon after his return to Rome, his friends obtained of him the office of quæstor; but he was not destined to enjoy it long. Caligula had died during his absence; had he lived longer Seneca would have travelled farther. He had intended visiting India; indeed, some think that he did visit that country; but there is no other proof of the fact than that Pliny, the naturalist, tells us that Seneca had written a memoir on India.*

Whether he visited India or not, he expected to be treated favourably by Claudius; but that emperor did not occupy the throne more than a few months, when the philosopher was arrested and sent into exile. Different reasons are assigned for his banishment. It is insinuated by Dio Cassius that he was implicated in the charge of adultery made by Messalina, one of his bitterest enemies, against Julia, the daughter of Germanicus. Whether he was guilty or not of being one of the paramours of Julia, it must be admitted that he was rather licentious in his morals from his youth up to this time; indeed, he does not deny the fact himself, but frankly confesses, that could he have regulated his practices in accordance with his precepts, his ethics would have exercised a much more powerful influence on his contemporaries than they did.†

He was in his forty-first year when he was thus banished to Corsica; but even Ovid did not grieve more profoundly for being exiled from Rome. During the first two years of his banishment he tried to conceal his grief, hoping from day to day that his friends would be able to procure him his liberty; but he was doomed to hope in vain for eight years. His letter, written to his mother towards the close of the first year of his exile,‡ is one of the finest of his productions. He tries to console her, not only under the misfortune that had befallen her in his banishment, but also under all her other sorrows. With this view, he undertakes to demonstrate to her that he had lost nothing, that disgrace had cast him down

* Seneca etiam apud nos tentata Indiæ commentatione septuaginta omnes ejus prodidit gentes duodeviginti centumque.—*Hist. Nat.*, vi., 17.

† Vide *De Vita Beata*, c. xviii.

‡ De Consolatione ad Helviam Matrem.

without discouraging him, and that exile, poverty, and ignominy are not evils; but his subsequent conduct proved but too plainly that his feelings were very different from his expressions.

His course now was remarkably similar in some important respects, to that pursued under somewhat similar circumstances by Lord Bacon, nearly sixteen centuries later. All our readers are familiar with the gross adulation in which the author of the *Novum Organum* indulged in his disgrace, with the view of influencing the king in his favour. He not only praised the king himself as the greatest of earthly monarchs, comparing him to the Almighty, but he was equally lavish of his eulogies on all whom he knew to be his majesty's favourites. It is generally admitted by his biographers, that he disgraced himself more by this conduct, than even by that for which he was condemned by the Parliament, assuming that he was really guilty of having accepted bribes while presiding on the bench; yet his was but a slight meanness, compared to that of Seneca at this crisis.

One letter of the Roman philosopher to Polybius, the freedman of Claudius, entitled *De Consolatione ad Polybium*, has scarcely a parallel in its kind. In this, he throws himself in the dust at the feet of the freedman, lauding him to the skies, declaring that the world can only boast of one greater man—that one being Claudius. As for the latter, there is no noble quality which he does not possess; the admiration of Seneca for his virtues and character is unbounded; his devotion to him is equally great; he wishes to adore him in all humility, but above all things he invokes his *divine* clemency.*

The ostensible object of this communication to Polybius was to console him on the death of his brother; what the real object was, need not be mentioned any further than that the bereaved Polybius happened to be the chief favourite of Claudius at this time, and that it was hoped, therefore, the emperor would have an opportunity of seeing how profoundly he was admired and venerated by the man who perhaps above all others had most reason

* Eriperes illi bonam opinionem? Solidior est hæc apud eum, ut à te quoque ipsa concuti posset. Eriperes bonam valetudinem? Sciebas animum ejus liberalibus disciplinis quibus non innutritus tantum sed innatus est. * * Longissimum illi ævum ingenii fama promissit. Id ejit ipse a meliore sui parte duraret, et compositis eloquentiæ preclaris operibus à mortalitate se vindicaret, &c.—*Cons. ad Pol.*, c. xxi.

to detest him. This *Consolatio* is so full of human weakness, not to give it a harsher name, that several of the biographers of Seneca, including Diderot and Ruhkopf, have denied its authenticity. But this is of no use, the proofs of its genuineness are too strong. There is not a passage in it which is not marked by the peculiar characteristics of Seneca's style. The mode of reasoning throughout, the moral precepts by which every argument is enforced, as well as the eulogies both on the freedman and the emperor, all very clearly point to Seneca as the author.

The most probable view of the work is that given by Justus Lipsius, who says that it was not intended for publication, and that it was by an indiscretion on the part of one of the author's friends it was made public. This opinion is considerably strengthened by the fact, that nearly twenty chapters of the beginning of the *Consolatio* are wanting. Doubtless the indiscreet friend suppressed the part which he thought would reflect most discredit on the writer; and yet it is difficult to conceive any grosser flatteries than those contained in the part that has come down to us.

At the same time we must not consider Seneca as having acted foolishly, although he certainly acted unworthily. The morality of his adulations is, indeed, not good, yet there is a certain kind of philosophy in them. As a means to the end he sought, they were probably the most potent he could have used. It is true that they had not an immediate effect; nearly five years had intervened from the writing of the *Consolatio* until the recall of the author from exile; but it is more than probable that Polybius was in no hurry to serve the cause of one who might become his rival, by making the emperor familiar with the contents of a communication which was not addressed to his majesty. It is true that Agrippina, the fourth wife of Claudius, has generally received the credit of having caused the liberation of Seneca; but this is rather inconsistent with the cause assigned for his exile. If he was banished from Rome, and forbidden to leave the island of Corsica, for having been an accomplice in the adultery of Julia, the daughter of Germanicus, it was not likely that Agrippina, bold as she undoubtedly was, would signalize her nuptials with Claudius by requesting the recall of one banished for such an offence, no matter how viciously inclined she was herself. Still more unlikely was it that she would bring him into the

palace so soon after her marriage, and make him the tutor of her son, Nero.

It is much more rational to believe that the flatteries of Seneca, gross and absurd as they were, had the desired effect on Claudius; for the philosopher had been made prætor and admitted into the senate, by the emperor, before he was brought to the palace as the tutor of Nero. Seneca could then reply somewhat as follows to those who sneered at his meanness in almost worshipping Claudius as a deity, in return for his having banished him as a criminal: There would have been no use in addressing Claudius in the language of reason and moderation. It was only by mocking him to his face that he could be influenced. I mocked him accordingly, and my mockery produced the desired effect in due time. Had I told Claudius what he really was, instead of what no mortal can ever be, I would still, at this day, have continued to languish in the swamps of Corsica.

This is in entire accordance with his satire in prose and verse on the death of Claudius, entitled, *Ἀποκολοκύνθωσις* ("The Metamorphosis into a Gourd");* in which he ridicules him quite as much as he praised him in his *Consolatio ad Polybium*. Indeed, it would be difficult to decide which production does most discredit to the philosopher. The first had an object; the author yearned to return to Rome; but the second had none, except the author wished to gratify Agrippina, by showing that, in poisoning her husband and uncle, she only committed an act for which all ought to commend rather than censure her. Considered in any light, such an attack on the murdered dead was not merely in bad taste; it was base—nearly if not quite as much so, as the murder, which made it safe to make it. Accordingly its authenticity is denied by some of the biographers of Seneca, like that of the *Consolatio ad Polybium*. But one as well as the other bears the obvious impress of Seneca's style, it would be much easier to prove that he is not the author of the *Questiones Naturales*, *De Ira*, and *De Clementia*, than of this bitter satire on the poisoned Claudius. A writer may be so closely imitated, however, that there would be some reason in denying the authenticity of the *Apocolocyntosis*, if Seneca had done nothing else deserving of censure; but, unfortunately, this cannot be pretended.

* This curious production commences as follows:—*Quid actum sit in cœlo ante diem tertium eidus octobris, anno novo, initio felicissimi, volo memoriæ tradere.*—*Claudii Cusoris Apocol.*

But Seneca had another literary task to perform on the death of Claudius before the satire. The emperor being dead, usage required that his successor should do honour to his memory. Accordingly Seneca prepared a funeral oration for Nero, which regarded Claudius as a new divinity, and which, according to Tacitus, it was impossible to hear without laughing, so gross were its praises of the numerous virtues of the deceased emperor.*

His warmest admirers are forced to admit that he committed more than one fatal error ; that in more than one instance he pursued a course that flatly contradicted those moral precepts, the essential importance of which he took so much pains to impress on others. It is beyond question that he struggled hard to restrain the vicious propensities of Nero ; and he was equally anxious to curb the ambition of his mother, Agrippina. His advice to both was undoubtedly good ; at the same time he was far too ready to gratify the worst wishes of each. This is but too evident from the testimony of Tacitus, who had no disposition to misrepresent Seneca. Indeed, the philosopher himself does not deny that there was a vast difference between his preaching and his practice. "I am not a sage," he was wont to say, "nor shall I ever be one. It is not *of myself I speak* when I write, *but of virtue* ; and when I bring the vices of individuals to trial, I will commence with my own. As soon as I can, I will live as it is proper to live."†

The first year of Nero's rule was highly creditable to pupil and tutor. All classes had begun to regard the young emperor as destined to restore the ancient greatness of Rome. Seneca had written several works for the express purpose of teaching his pupil to govern with moderation and clemency ; he also wrote an oration for him, which gave universal satisfaction. It was delivered by the new emperor on his first appearance in the senate ; there was nothing good which a great people had a right to expect from their sovereign which it did not promise in the blandest and most condescending language. Such was the effect of this harangue, according to Dio Cassius, that it was ordered by a unanimous vote of the senate to be engraven on a pillar of solid silver, and to be publicly read every year when the consuls entered on their office.

It is easy to understand that the success of this oration gave Seneca a great ascendancy over Nero, and he re-

* Tacitus, *Annales*, xiii., 3.

† De Vita Beata ch. xviii.

solved to maintain it without much scruple as to the means. Well aware of the licentious habits of the young emperor, he thought he could not please him better, or more effectually curb his lawless passions, than by procuring him a beautiful mistress. With this view he engaged the services of his friend, Annæus Serenus, who managed the task confided to him in a manner highly satisfactory both to Nero and Seneca. But the indignation of Agrippina at finding another preferred to herself knew no bounds; she reproached Seneca in the presence of the emperor. But if she had any ascendancy over her son ever afterward, it was but of brief duration. The former patroness of the philosopher was now his worst enemy; and, if we are to judge from the course of events, her hatred was reciprocated by Seneca.

So stung was Agrippina with jealousy, that she had the rashness to threaten Nero with annulling what she had done in his favour, and nominating Britannicus as the lawful heir of Claudius. This proved the death-warrant of the unfortunate Britannicus, who, in a few days after, was poisoned at his table. It may be that Seneca could not have prevented the horrible fratricide; but what is unaccountable is, that so severe a moralist could continue to reside at a court which was disgraced almost daily with the worst species of vice and crime. If we believe his contemporaries, he had strong inducements to retain his ascendancy over Nero as long as possible. He is accused of being inordinately fond of money and riches, notwithstanding his fine precepts in favour of poverty; and that he acquired enormous wealth is beyond question. Still he continued to be popular, until one of his enemies denounced him publicly. That P. Suillius, who accused him, was himself a transgressor, and was, doubtless, influenced by vindictive motives, did not save the philosopher from public odium when that person asked him, "By what wisdom, by what precepts of philosophy, he had, during a four years' intimacy with an emperor, amassed a fortune of three hundred million sesterii? at Rome he was a hunter after testamentary gifts—an ensnarer of those who were childless, &c."* These were serious charges against the philosopher-prime-minister. No doubt they were exaggerated at worst, but Seneca did not evince much wisdom in the manner in which he

* *Qua sapientia, quibus philosophorum præceptis, intra quadriennium regie amicitiæ ter millies sesterium paravisset? Roma testamenta et orbos velut indagine ejus capi.*—Tacitus, *Annales*, xiii., 42.

sought to vindicate himself. He immediately had his accuser arrested and sent into exile; the son of Lucilius, wishing to share the captivity of his father, declared himself an accomplice in his crime, but he was not suffered to accompany him. From this day forth Seneca was falling in public estimation, although there were many still who believed that it was impossible for him to be guilty of the conduct attributed to him. This state of feeling, however, did not last long; the circumstances attending the death of Agrippina were such that all regarded Seneca as implicated in her assassination. It is probable that he could not have saved her, but he could at least have protested against the murder; if his protest was not attended to, he could have withdrawn, although not without incurring much danger.

The history of this matricide is so well known to every intelligent person, that it would be superfluous to do more than allude to it here. There is no crime in all history that shows more baseness. In commenting on the connection of Seneca and his colleague, Burrhus, with it as accomplices, Tacitus remarks that one cannot say whether they were already in the secret. Both remained silent a long time, when the proposition was made to them. Finally, Seneca turned towards Burrhus and asked if the order had been given to the soldiers to kill Agrippina; Burrhus replied that the Prætorian guard would hesitate to meddle with the daughter of Germanicus. Anicetus, less scrupulous, undertook to commit the deed.* Nero fled to Naples, whence he addressed a letter to the senate, in which he enumerated several attempts of his mother to dethrone him and seize on the government; adding, that failing in her last attempt, she committed suicide, and that her doing so was a benefit to the State.

All who have investigated the subject attribute the authorship of this letter to Seneca; and it is impossible to deny the fact. "It was no longer against Nero the public murmured," says Tacitus, "but against the barbarity of Seneca, who sought to justify such a crime."† But he did not long survive it himself. Agrippina was not long dead when his colleague Burrhus also died, rather suddenly, the general impression being that he was poisoned by his master. This, combined with the public odium against himself, made Seneca wish to retire into private life; and he asked permission from Nero to do so, offering at the

* Tac., *Ann.* xiv. 3.

† *Ann.*, xiv. 11.

same time to deliver up all his wealth. But the tyrant was not done with him yet. He replied very graciously, protesting that it was impossible for him to deprive himself of the counsel of such a friend. The philosopher was forced to yield, but thenceforward he absented himself as much as possible, under one pretext or another, and while absent he devoted himself to agriculture, subsisting chiefly on wild fruits, and drinking but the water which he took with his own hands from the brook.

Dio Cassius thinks that it was not exclusively for the sake of temperance and frugality that he pursued this course, but through fear; an opinion which is sustained by Tacitus, who twice remarks that Nero had attempted to poison Seneca, but failed.* But the conspiracy of Piso afforded the tyrant a pretext to dispose of him in another way; the philosopher having been accused of complicity in the attempt of Piso, Nero sent a tribune to his country residence with a troop of soldiers, ordering him to put himself to death. Tacitus gives a most touching account of his last moments. He tells us that the friends which surrounded Seneca burst into tears, and that without showing any sign of alarm, he tried to cheer them by the lessons of philosophy, remarking, that he who had murdered a brother and a mother could not be expected to spare his teacher.†

Whatever were the faults of Seneca, it is certain that he possessed the faculty of laying a strong hold on the affections of those around him. He was over sixty years of age when he married Paulina, a young, beautiful, and noble Roman lady; and no lady of any age could be more tenderly attached to her husband. Seeing her ready to sink down with grief, Seneca begged of her to bear this event with a little more patience for his sake, telling her that now the hour was come wherein he was to show, not by argument and discourse, but by effect, the fruit he had acquired by his studies, and that he really embraced his death not only without grief, but with joy. "Wherefore, my dearest," he added, "do not dishonour it with thy tears, that it may not seem as if thou lovest thyself more than my reputation; moderate thy grief, and comfort thyself in the knowledge thou hast had of me and my actions, leading the remainder of thy life in the same virtuous manner thou hast hitherto done." Paulina proved a true heroine; her name deserves to be

* *Annales*, xv., 45, 60.

† *Ann.*, xv., 62.

ever remembered as an honour to her sex. Her reply to her dying husband is full of magnanimity and tenderness: "No, Seneca; I am not a woman to suffer you to go alone in such a necessity; I will not have you think that the virtuous examples of your life have not yet taught me how to die; and when can I ever do it better or more becomingly, or more to my own desire, than with you? and therefore assure yourself I will go along with you."

Although well convinced of her affection and fidelity, her husband was surprised at her fortitude and courage. "Paulina, I have sufficiently instructed you in what would serve you happily to live; but I see you covet more the honour of dying. In truth, I will not grudge it you, as you are thus resolved; the constancy and resolution in our common end are the same; but the beauty and glory on your part are much greater."*

The historians inform us that both now agreed to have the veins of their arms opened at the same time by the surgeons. Tacitus says that those of Seneca were so much shrunken with age and abstinence, causing his blood to flow more slowly, that he ordered the veins of his thighs to be opened also; and lest the torments he endured should intimidate his wife, and also to relieve himself from the affliction of seeing her in so sad a condition, after having taken leave of her most affectionately, he entreated that she would suffer herself to be carried to her chamber, which she accordingly did. Finding that all the incisions made on him had only the effect of increasing his sufferings, he ordered his physician to give him a dose of hemlock; this also failed. Finally, he was put into a hot bath; then finding his end approach, he made an address to his friends; and his secretaries continued to write his words as long as he was able to speak. Nero, having been informed of what passed, sent orders in all haste to have the wounds of Paulina bound up; not that he cared for her death, or had any feeling for her more than for her husband; but as her relatives were among the most illustrious and most powerful in Rome, he feared lest her death might cause a revolt against him. Paulina, being already unconscious from loss of blood, could make no resistance; but, though she was prevented from dying, her complexion continued

* *Vitæ delinimenta monstraveram tibi tu mortis decus mavis; non inuidebo exemplo.*—Tac., *Ann.*, xv., 63.

pale for the few years she survived, and during which she held her husband in honourable memory.*

Hitherto we have considered Seneca only as a public man. The record we have been able to make of him, as such, is far from being what we should like. But in forming a final judgment of him, different circumstances are to be taken into account. We are bound to remember that even when a mere boy his acquirements and talents were of a character to excite envy; it is certain that when eighteen, few if any Romans of the same age were equally brilliant and learned. He also laboured under the disadvantage of being a foreigner at Rome. It is very true that none were more liberal in this respect than the Romans; they were far more cosmopolitan than the Greeks, or indeed any other people. Still they had their prejudices; they were quite willing to allow foreigners equal rights with themselves; but they regarded it as humiliating to acknowledge even Athenian philosophers as their superiors in learning and genius. And we have seen that the philosopher was not the only member of the Seneca family who was distinguished by superior intellectual endowments; there was not a member of it who did not possess intellectual capacity of a high order. There have been few families of any age that have produced within the same generation three such authors and thinkers as Seneca, the philosopher, Marcus Annæus his father, and Lucan his nephew, all Iberians, born at Corduba, for which they secured a universal recognition as the modern Athens.

Corduba præstantum genetrix fœcunda virorum.†

The *Pharsalia* of Lucan, written when he was a mere youth, has been ranked with the noblest epics. It has been compared by eminent critics to the *Iliad* and the *Æneid*. This, indeed, is exaggerated praise; it is far inferior to either, but it contains passages scarcely excelled in spirit, or sublimity, by any similar passages in Homer, or Virgil. Lucan was the author of several other works, including a poem on the burning of Troy, entitled *Catacausmas Iliacus*. Thus while Seneca discoursed eloquently on philosophy and morals, Lucan wrote poems marked with epic grandeur. As already remarked, the Seneca family belonged to the equestrian order and possessed wealth. None of this character could well

* Tac., *Ans. Ann.*, xv., 64.

† Martial.

avoid holding office at Rome even in Nero's time ; nor did Lucan form an exception. Nero thought so highly of the young man that he condescended to vie with him in the public games ; the judges chosen to decide the relative merits of the rivals awarded the palm to Lucan, which as many anticipated at the time proved equivalent to the death-warrant of the poet. The tyrant first showed his spite by forbidding Lucan from publishing his poem on the burning of Troy, under pain of immediate banishment. Soon after the conspiracy of Piso was brought to light, Lucan, as well as Seneca, was accused as an accomplice ; and the poet as well as the philosopher was doomed to die. Lucan also caused his veins to be opened ; and Tacitus informs us that while he felt the chill of death extending to his arms and feet, he recited verses in which he had described a wounded soldier dying of the same death. Such was the fate of the nephew of Seneca, in his twenty-seventh year, while he was consul elect for the following year.

Men of this class have always enemies. Young as Lucan was, his character was also assailed with the greatest bitterness. Notwithstanding the heroic manner in which he died, he was accused of the basest cowardice. It was said of him, that in order to evade the charge of treason made against him, he denounced his own mother Acilia. A still worse course, if such was possible, was pursued against Seneca. That the philosopher was guilty of many errors cannot be denied ; but it is certain that many were attributed to him which he never committed, and that the faults of which he was really guilty were grossly exaggerated. Had it been otherwise the severest and most impartial of the Roman satirists would have spoken of him in very different language from that which he applies to him in several of his satires. But there is not a word in Juvenal which implies that the poet regarded the philosopher as a bad man. Alluding to the rumour that the conspirators, headed by Piso, were to have made Seneca emperor, Juvenal maintains in his eighth satire that if the people had been allowed the uncontrolled exercise of their votes, none would have been found so abandoned as not to have preferred Seneca to Nero.

*Libera si dentur populo suffragia, quis tam
Perditus, ut dubitet Senecam preferre Neroni.*

Even Quintilian, one of the most impartial of all the Roman writers whose works have reached us, was un-

doubtedly jealous of his glory; this we will show in the proper place, but it will be seen at the same time that, however unfriendly the feelings of the critic may be, he cannot deny that the works of the philosopher possessed the elements of true greatness.

Before entering into any discussion of the philosophy or ethics of Seneca, it may be well to take a cursory glance at such of his works as have come down to us. The one generally supposed to have been first written is that on Anger.* If this opinion be correct, the work was produced in the time of Caligula, when the author was young and inexperienced; whereas it is one of the best written of all his productions, and it is inferior to none in its reasoning. The letters of "Consolation," addressed to Polybius, to Marcia, and to Helvia, his mother, have already been alluded to, and compared with each other. The communications to the two ladies, especially that to the author's mother, are highly creditable in every sense. Both are at once eloquent and touching, and such is the piety with which they are imbued, that they might well be mistaken for some of the epistles of the early Christians. Those who read them would find it difficult to believe that the Consolation to Polybius could possibly have emanated from the same mind, were it not that the evidence of their common paternity is unfortunately but too clear. The work "On Providence"† is but fragmentary. It is not a regular treatise, but it is much more valuable than many such. The object of it is to justify Providence against the cavils and murmurs of those who complain that the good often suffer more in this world than the wicked. The reasoning of the philosopher in vindication of Divine justice is clear and convincing. Pope has borrowed from it some of the finest thoughts in his "Essay on Man;" nor is this the only work of Seneca from which the same poet and many other modern moralists have drawn inspiration. But "De Providentia" has one serious fault; it concludes by recommending suicide to the unfortunate as their surest refuge from worldly ills, as if the author wished to show that, notwithstanding the truly Christian spirit of his precepts, he is not a disciple of Christ. In several of his works we find similar inconsistencies and contrasts; through several pages he reasons like a pious and orthodox Christian, but he too frequently

* De Ira.

† De Providentia, sive quare bonis viris mala accidunt, cum sit Providentia.

concludes like a Pagan. In his essay on "Tranquillity of Mind," * Seneca shows his friend Annæus Serenus how he is to cure himself of the disquietude and disgust of life of which he complains.

There is scarcely one of the philosophical sects of his time whose precepts are not adopted by Seneca, according as he thinks they are good and useful to society; but, as we have already remarked, his chief leaning is towards the Stoics. This is fully illustrated in his dissertation "On the Firmness of the Sage; or, Proof that the wise man can suffer no injury." † When the author was in exile, and on many other occasions, it was sufficiently evident that he suffered injury; it was because he felt injured that he had his enemy and traducer, Suilius, sent into exile; but perhaps the philosopher did not claim to be wise at this time.

The treatise "On Clemency," ‡ addressed to Nero, contains some excellent passages, but also some contradictions. It shows that while the author wished to give his pupil good advice, he deemed it prudent, at the same time, to flatter his vanity; its main object, however, is to show that princes should govern with mildness and moderation. Because a considerable part of the work is lost, some of those who are disposed to accept the statements of the author's enemies, allege that Macchiavelli borrowed some of the odious maxims of his "Prince" from this work; but whatever objections may be made to certain passages in the part which remains, it will be seen that it contains sufficient to prove that the philosopher could have given no bad advice in it without stultifying himself.

Another good essay is that "On the Shortness of Life," § It is addressed to Paulinus, the father of his second wife, the beautiful and heroic Paulina, whose noble conduct at the death of her husband we have described above. In this we have another of the contradictions of Seneca; for although he advises Serenus to seek public employments as a means of rendering life attractive to him instead of being a burden, he recommends Paulinus to retire from public life, resigning his position as Præfectus Annonæ for the same purpose.

Seneca has been much censured for inconsistencies of this kind, but without sufficient reason. Why should not

* De Animi tranquillitate.

† De Constantia sapientis, sive quod in sapientem non cadit injuria.

‡ De Clementia.

§ De Brevitate Vitæ.

philosophers have the privilege of changing their minds as well as meaner mortals? What do they study for? Is it not to become wiser from day to day? If they do become wiser, why should they not be permitted to alter their views when they find that their first impressions were erroneous? What would be said of the astronomer, who, having once mistaken a comet for a planet, must needs adhere to his old theory lest he might be accused of inconsistency or blundering, although his improved optical instruments, aided by more accurate calculations, convince him that his former theory was wrong? Seneca was a severe student through life; when he was most occupied at the court of Nero; while those who were obnoxious to the tyrant were falling almost daily by poison or the dagger, the philosopher was adding more or less to his stock of knowledge; and, in proportion as he did so, he changed his mind.

The essay "On a Happy Life,"* is addressed to the author's brother, Gallio, who was proconsul of Achaia, and behaved with such enlightened liberality when St. Paul was accused before him at Corinth. We may remark, in passing, that the strong attachment of Seneca to his friends, was a striking trait in his character. Even his enemies cannot say that he ever treated a true friend otherwise than fairly. It is true that Agrippina and Claudius loaded him with honours; it is also true that he is charged with ingratitude for his treatment to both when they were no longer able to serve or to injure him. But he never considered either as a true friend. His impression to the last was that it was with the view of forwarding their own designs, and not for any love of him, that each conferred honours on him; and none acquainted with their history will be disposed to deny the fact.

But to all his relatives the philosopher had the kindness of a father. When his nephew, Lucan, was accused of treason by Nero, Seneca was more uneasy about his fate than his own; and that his affection was fully reciprocated by his friends, we have abundant evidence. His father doated on him as long as he lived; his brothers, nephews, and nieces were warmly attached to him; and what wife could have evinced more devotion for her husband than the young and beautiful Paulina did for the aged Seneca. His letters to Lucilius, of which one hundred and twenty-four are extant, would have proved by themselves that

* *De Vita Beata.*

he was constant and faithful in his friendships; and they would also have vindicated his claim to the character of a philosopher and moralist.

One of Seneca's best works is that "On Benefits." * This, as well as the letters to Lucilius, was written after the author had retired from court. He was at least sixty-seven years when he wrote it, and there is no finer specimen of his writings. He describes the proper manner of conferring benefits, and points out the duties of those who receive them; then, in the form of episodes, he treats of gratitude and ingratitude.

Passing over some works of minor interest, we come to the "Seven books of Questions on Nature," † which is one of the most curious and interesting monuments that antiquity has left us. Those who read this work carefully, cannot form a low estimate of the scientific attainments of the Romans even in Nero's time. It discusses a large variety of subjects in natural philosophy, including many phenomena of which it is generally supposed at the present day the ancients knew nothing. The author's remarks on the inundations of the Nile; the geological characteristics of Egypt; the nature of earthquakes, volcanoes, &c., might easily be mistaken for those of some of the most recent modern investigators. They are very much superior to the similar "Questions" of Bacon, although much more modestly put forward than those of the latter. "The theory of earthquakes," says Humboldt, "as given by Seneca, contains the germ of all that has been stated in our times concerning the action of elastic vapours enclosed in the interior of the globe." ‡

Some critics attribute several tragedies to Seneca, namely, *Media*, *Hippolytus*, *Hercules in Ceta*, *Agamemnon*, *Thyestes*, and *Hercules Furens*. By far the best of all is *Media*, and this is the only one that Quintilian and Lipsius regard as his; they think the rest were either written by his father, or by some other member of the Seneca family; and there is good reason to believe that they are right, for the style of all the tragedies, with the sole exception of the *Media*, is inferior to that of even the most careless passages in his other writings.

Fourteen letters, purporting to have been written to St. Paul, have also been attributed to Seneca. They were printed in several of the earlier editions of his

* De Beneficiis.

† Naturalium Questionum, libri vii.

‡ Voyage aux contrées équinoxiales, vol. i., pp. 313, 4to.

works, and none seemed to have questioned their genuineness; but they are now almost universally regarded as spurious. Indeed, it is impossible to regard them in any other light without assuming that the philosopher had greatly degenerated in his style, for the Latin of the letters to St. Paul is absolutely barbarous. The probability is that they were forged in the middle ages. As the apostle was undoubtedly at Rome some years before the death of Seneca, and was well treated by the philosopher's brother Gallio, if not by himself, it was not difficult to make the credulous readers of the middle ages believe that an extensive correspondence was carried on between the two reformers. The plausibility of such a theory was much increased by the fact that there are very few of the great maxims of Christianity which are not found in one form or other in the writings of Seneca. But the improbability that he would entirely alter his style in writing to so learned a linguist as St. Paul—making use of a semi-barbarous Latinity—is not the only argument against the genuineness of the letters alluded to. Chronology affords one still more conclusive if possible. St. Paul was in nominal captivity at Rome in the year 62 A. D., and Seneca was put to death at the beginning of 65. The date of Paul's Epistle to the Romans is generally supposed to have been the year 62, scarcely any believe that it was made public earlier; whereas, nearly all the works of Seneca, including several of his letters to Lucilius, had been published before the year 60. How, then, could he have borrowed all his pious maxims from St. Paul's Epistle? The impossibility of this will be the more apparent when it is borne in mind that in none of the works of Seneca is he more Christian-like than in his *De Ira*, which was one of the first of his productions, and was written, at least, eighteen years (44) before the visit of the apostle to Rome. At this time Paul had not written his first Epistle; nor is it likely that a single book of the New Testament had seen the light.*

It is idle then, to regard St. Paul as the instructor of Seneca, notwithstanding the decidedly Christian character of many of the maxims of the philosopher, as we shall see presently. In the mean time let us remember, that there are many thoughts in the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero which have been adopted by the most pious

* *Vide*, Etude critique sur les rapports supposés entre Sénèque et Saint Paul, par Aubertin, Svo, Paris, 1857.

Christians, and each of those great thinkers has been carefully studied by Seneca. He was also familiar with the dogmas of Pythagoras and Zoroaster; and it cannot be denied that he was an original thinker himself.

We have already remarked, that although Seneca availed himself of good maxims wherever he found them, he had a decided partiality for the Stoic doctrines; and it must not be forgotten that whatever were the faults of the Stoics, they made a nearer approach to Christianity, at least in their ethics, than any other ancient sect. It is not strange, therefore, that their chief representative is more like a Christian in his precepts and modes of thinking, than any other ancient philosopher. There is not one of his philosophical works, which does not contain evidence of this similarity. None of the Fathers of the Church has written more piously of the Creator, than Seneca has in his work "On Providence."

"Every man knows," he says, "without telling, that this wonderful fabric of the universe is not without a governor; and that the constant order cannot be the work of chance; for the parts would then fall foul one upon another. The motions of the stars, *and their influences*, are acted by the command of an eternal decree. It is by the dictate of an Almighty Power that the heavy body of the earth *hangs in balance*. Whence come the revolutions of the seasons, and the flux of the rivers? the wonderful virtue of the smallest seeds? as an *oak* to arise from an *acorn*."

With the same view the author then proceeds to point out many of the phenomena of nature, including volcanoes, earthquakes, boiling fountains, the tides, new islands starting out of the sea, &c. Seneca is equally earnest and eloquent in proving the immortality of the soul.

"When the day shall come," he says, "that will separate this composition, human and divine, *I will leave this body here, where I found it, and return to the gods*; not that I am altogether absent from them even now; though detained from superior happiness, by this heavy earthly clog. This short stay in mortal life, *is but the prelude to a better, and more lasting life above*. As we are detained nine months in our mother's womb, which prepares us *not for itself, to dwell always therein, but to that place wherunto we are sent, as soon as we are fit to breathe the vital air, and strong enough to bear the light*; so, in that space of time, which reacheth from infancy to old age inclusive, we aspire after another birth as from the womb of Nature. Another beginning, another state of things expects us. We cannot as yet reach heaven, till duly qualified by this interval."

It is needless to show how many of the sentiments contained in this passage are in strict accordance with the

teachings of the Bible. Neither Christian nor Pagan has defined reason more correctly, or more beautifully, than Seneca; nor has any one more happily exhibited the difference between man and the lower animals.

"Fertility," says he, "recommends the vine, as a fine flavour does the juice of the grape; the excellency in a stag is swiftness; in beasts of burden, a strong back; an exquisite quickness of scent distinguishes the hound; speed the greyhound; fierceness and courage the bull-dog, or such as are ordained to attack wild beasts: and what is the excellency in man? Reason. It is this, wherein man excels the brute creation, and draws near to the gods. Perfect reason, therefore, is the proper good of men. Other qualities he hath in common with plants and animals: is he strong? so are lions. Is he beautiful? so are peacocks. Is he swift? so are horses. I do not say how far he may excel, or be excelled in any of these points; for I am not inquiring after what is greatest in him, but what is his own. Has he a body? so has a tree. Has he internal power of self-motion? so have beasts, and even worms. Hath he a voice? some dogs have a louder; more shrill is that of the eagle, more deep that of the bull; and more sweet and voluble is the voice of the nightingale. What, then, is proper only to man? Reason. This, when right and perfect, completes the happiness of man."

No philosopher of any age could claim a nobler ancestry than Seneca. His family belonged to the nobility in every sense of the term; it was at once ancient, wealthy, intellectual, and well informed. But there was no haughtiness in the character of Seneca. He valued all men, not according to their rank or ancestry, but according to their intelligence and worth. As there are exceptions to all rules, so in this case Claudius and Nero may be regarded as exceptions in relation to the conduct of Seneca. But all others to whom Seneca pretended friendship were really good men; and it was for their goodness and wisdom they were distinguished, not for their wealth or ancient lineage. This was true both of Annæus Serenus, and of Burrhus; and it was equally true of Lucilius, to whom the philosopher addressed the one hundred and twenty-four letters of his that are still extant. He is perfectly consistent with himself, therefore, in maintaining that virtue is the only nobility, and that we should treat all men according to their merits, as he recommends in the following passage:—

"It is not well done to be still murmuring against nature and fortune; as if it were their unkindness that makes you inconsiderable, when it is only by your own weakness that you make yourself so; for it is virtue, not pedigree, that renders a man either valuable or happy. Philosophy does not either reject or choose any man for his quality. Socrates was no patrician, Cleanthes but an under-gardener; neither did Plato dignify philosophy by his birth, but by his goodness. All these

worthy men are our progenitors, if we will but do ourselves the honour to become their disciples. The original of all mankind was the same; and it is only a clear conscience that makes any man noble; for that derives even from heaven itself. It is the saying of a great man, that if we could but trace our descents, we should find all slaves to come from princes, and all princes from slaves."

We need adduce no further evidence of the eminently humane and enlightened character of Seneca's philosophy, but still more noble if possible is the morality which he everywhere inculcates. If he did not act in accordance with that morality himself, as many of his contemporaries allege, the fact is to be regretted; but no sensible person rejects gold because found in combination with the basest and most poisonous of metals. The precepts of Seneca possess a value which is altogether independent of their author. If their author were entirely unknown they would lose none of their value, because it is not their authorship, but the truth which they contain, that renders them valuable and useful.

In presenting our readers a few of these maxims of Seneca as specimens we must necessarily be discursive and brief; nor can we pretend that those we can collect in this cursory manner will always be the best in themselves, or the most characteristic of the author. But if they show that, whatever were his faults, he was a great moralist, one of our chief objects in discussing the subject will have been attained.

There is no gift on which Seneca sets a higher value than wisdom; yet he assures us that if it were offered to him on condition that he would keep it exclusively to himself, he would not wish it.*

He cared nothing for the fame of authorship. Any one so disposed, he writes to his friend Lucilius, might accuse him of borrowing or plagiarizing, but he was resolved to appropriate a good and useful idea wherever he found it.† In another epistle he says that whatever is true, is his‡—that is, it is common property, as emanating from the Deity. Of a kindred character is the maxim that philosophy is not intended to show light to a few favored individuals, but like the sun is designed by the Creator for the benefit of all.§

* In hoc gaudeo aliquid discere ut doceam: nec me ulla res delectabit, licet eximia sit et salutaria, quam mihi uni sciturus sim. Si cum hac exceptione detur sapientia, ut illam inclusam teneam, rejiciam.—*Ep.* 6.

† Quidquid bene dictum est ab ullo meum est.—*Ep.* 16.

‡ Quod verum est meum est.—*Ep.* 12.

§ Non rejicit quemquam philosophia nec elijit: omnibus lucet.—*Ep.* 44.

He tries to excuse his own weakness when in exile in one of his letters to Lucilius. "There are certain movements," he says, "which we cannot control; our tears gush forth against our will and these tears soothe us. Sometimes we may obey nature without compromising our dignity."* In another letter he presents the same idea in another point of view. "It is idle to say that the sage must not be moved at any thing; that his soul ought to be as exempt from troubles and storms as the ether which is above the clouds." Seneca was a firm believer in the unity of the human race; at least he sought to make all mankind regard each other as brothers. "Philosophy teaches us," he says "to adore God and to love men; to remember that the gods are the masters of all things, and that mankind form one family." Where can we find nobler precepts than the following?—"Treat your inferiors as you would be treated by your superiors. * * Permit yourself to do nothing in private which you would be afraid to do before your enemy."

In the *De Ira*, which is believed to have been the first written of Seneca's works, there are many noble sentiments. Here we find a "higher law" first inculcated. "No one need boast," he says, "of being good according to law. How many duties are incumbent on man which are not written in any code!"† It is in the same essay he tells us that man was designed by the Creator to be a helper to his fellow-man;‡ that to those who do evil we should express gentle and fraternal sentiments; and that we should remember that none of us can declare ourselves entirely innocent.§ The philosopher is still more Christian, if possible, in his *De Vita Beata*, in which he says that we should do good to those entirely unknown to us; to the wicked, and *even to our enemies*.|| It is by no means sufficient, he tells us, that our discourses please; they should bear fruit.¶

In short, the maxims of Seneca have been adopted by the moralists of every enlightened nation of modern times. This is particularly true of the following: "The most powerful man has reason to fear as much evil as he

* Hæc (philosophia) docet colere divina, humana diligere, et penes Deos imperium esse, inter homines consortium.—*Ep.* 90.

† *De Ira*, 11, 29.

‡ *Ib.*, 1, 5.

§ *Ib.*, 1.

|| Chap. 20.

¶ Non delectent verba nostra sed prosint. . . . Aliæ artes ad ingenium totæ pertinent, hic animi negotium agitur. Non querit æger medicum eloquentem sed sanantem.—*Ep.* 75.

can do." "A traveller has many hosts, but few friends." "Little minds carry into great things the vice which is innate in them." "The way of precept is long; that of example is shorter and surer." "A part of life is passed in doing evil, the greater part in doing nothing; almost the whole in doing any thing but what ought to be done."

These detached thoughts can give but a faint idea of the value of Seneca's ethics; but we think they show at least that the author was a great thinker, and that his works are worth reading.

For nearly seventeen hundred years Seneca has been alternately praised and decried, but if his numerous critics be examined, it will be found that his admirers are much more competent judges than his traducers. An example or two will suffice to prove this. All will admit that Pope was a greater moralist than Dryden—indeed, the latter is a very indifferent moralist, if he can be said to have any claim to the title—whereas the author of the "Essay on Man" is one of the greatest moralists the modern world has produced. But Pope had the greatest admiration for Seneca; whereas Dryden has given currency to the worst slanders of his enemies, at the same time condemning his writings as almost worthless. In France he has been assailed by Laharpe, who not only condemns the man, but makes an elaborate and tedious effort to disparage his writings.* Diderot, upon the other hand, has written an eloquent vindication of Seneca.† None who know the two authors need be informed of the superior abilities of Diderot; and the estimate of Diderot is, that "the portico, the academy, and the lyceum of Greece have produced no one comparable to Seneca in moral philosophy."‡

Still more emphatic, if possible, is the admiration of Montaigne, who quotes Seneca everywhere throughout his works, and devotes a whole essay to a vindication of Seneca and Plutarch.

Many have condemned Seneca as a teacher, because his pupil, Nero, proved a bad man and a tyrant. Need we say that this is very defective logic? How often have the most exemplary parents had the worst children? Many a good father has been assassinated by his son. Is

* *Vide* Cours de Littérature, tome III., part ii., pp. 160–348.

† *Essai sur la vie de Sénèque*, par M. Diderot.

‡ Le portique, l'académie, et le lycée de la Grèce n'ont rien produit de comparable à Sénèque pour la philosophie morale.—*Essai sur la vie de Sénèque*, c. xliv.

it more discreditable to any one to be murdered by his pupil than by his son? Seneca had many other pupils, but they all proved good men except Nero; all with the exception of Nero would have sacrificed their lives to save him, rather than put him to death themselves. But fortunately, Seneca has left us specimens enough of his mode of teaching to vindicate him fully in this respect. Knowing that his imperial pupil permitted himself to be influenced injuriously by idle tales, he pointed out to him the evil consequences of such a course; and he did so in a manner that rendered his advice applicable to all ranks of life and to every age. Such for example, is the character of the following passage:—

"It is good for every man to fortify himself on his weak side; and if he loves his peace, he must not be inquisitive, and hearken to tale-bearers; for the man that is over-curious to hear and see every thing, multiplies troubles to himself; for a man does not feel what he does not know. He that is listening after private discourse, and what people say of him, shall never be at peace. How many things that are innocent in themselves, are yet made injurious by misconstruction? Wherefore some things we are to pause upon, others to laugh at, others to pardon. Or, if we cannot avoid the sense of indignities, let us shun the open profession of it; which may be easily done, as appears by many examples of those that have suppressed their anger, under the awe of a greater fear. It is a good caution *not to believe any thing until we are very certain of it*; for many *probable* things prove *false*, and a short time will make evidence of the undoubted truth. We are prone to believe many things which we are unwilling to hear, and so we conclude, and take up a prejudice before we can judge. *Never condemn a friend unheard; or without letting him know his accuser, or his crime.*"

Not one of those who have condemned Seneca were capable of giving a nobler lesson than this. Had Nero only profited by it, he would not have committed one of the atrocities he did. If it be objected that this is the language of a moralist rather than of a literary instructor, and that it is not such as a tutor is expected to teach his pupil, we can find sufficient of the latter character also in the works of Seneca. Thus, in what author, ancient or modern, do we find more excellent thoughts than those in the philosopher's eighty-eighth Epistle to Lucilius, "On Liberal Studies?" "You see," he says in this essay, "why studies are called liberal; it is because they are worthy of a liberal man; besides, a study which is truly liberal, makes us liberal."* He then proceeds to examine whether liberal studies make a man good; and he

* Quare liberalia studia dicta sint, vides, quia homine libero digna sunt; ceterum unum studium vere liberale est, quod liberum facit.—*Ep. lxxxviii.*

shows that their tendency is to do so. At the same time, he makes distinctions which are too often lost sight of by teachers; he says, that while the study of grammar, logic, geometry, &c., is well calculated to develop the intellectual faculties, it is by no means sufficient to give the student a correct idea of right and wrong. He thinks that one may be very expert in the examination of words and syllables, in demonstrating propositions in geometry, and be well skilled in music, and yet be timid, greedy, and vicious.* Seneca shows that in teaching either a language or a science, the teacher has much more to do than to impress the principles of it on his pupil; he is bound to teach him the difference between right and wrong, partly by oral precepts, and partly by causing him to read good books which illustrate the benefits of virtue and the evil consequences of vice.

At the same time, Seneca would not have the minds of his pupils overtaxed; he would neither give them too many books, nor too many studies. He would have them understand one book, or science, or art, before taking up another. It were well that many of our modern teachers would adopt the same course; then there would be much more thoroughness and less pretension than there is. Referring to books, the philosopher says:—

“Be pleased likewise to consider that the reading many authors, and books of all sorts, betrays a vague and unsteady disposition. You must attach yourself to some in particular, and thoroughly digest what you read, if you would intrust the faithful memory with any thing of use. He that is everywhere is nowhere. They who spend their time in travelling, meet indeed, with many a host, but few friends. This is necessarily the case of those who apply *not familiarly to any one study but run over every thing cursorily and in haste*. The food profits not, nor gives due nourishment to the body, that abides not some time therein. Nothing so much prevents the recovery of health as a frequent change of *supposed remedies*. A wound is not soon healed, when different salves are tried by way of experiment. A plant thrives not, nor can well take root, that is moved from place to place.”

No educator worthy of the name will deny this. It is sufficiently evident to any reflecting mind, that those who study a dozen different branches at the same time, can not study any of them thoroughly. As well might one try to learn at the same time the crafts of the printer, the watchmaker, the carpenter, the shoemaker, and the tailor; he who makes such an attempt will be sure to fail. It is

* Quid ex his metum demit, cupiditatem eximit, libidinem frenat? Ad geometriam transemus, et ad musicum; nihil apud illas invenies quod vetet timere, vetet cupere; quæ quisquis ignorat, alia frustra scit.—*Ep. lxxxviii.*

much better and more creditable to understand one science or art thoroughly, than to have a vague, smattering knowledge of a dozen; at the same time it is not strange that none make louder pretensions, than those condemned by Seneca.

It is also Seneca who has given the best rules for letter-writing. "You complain," he writes to Lucilius, "that my letters are not written with sufficient care; but do we bestow that care on our conversation except we wish to speak in an affected manner? It is my wish that my letters may resemble a conversation which we have had together, sitting down or walking. My desire is that they may be simple and easy, and that they bear no trace either of research or labour." The best modern letter-writers, including Swift, Addison, Montaigne, Fontenelle, Cowper, and Chesterfield, have adopted this rule. If Seneca's own letters do not seem simple or easy, but may be regarded as essays rather than epistles, this does not render his opinion on the subject the less correct. Aristotle was not a poet in the ordinary acceptation of the term; yet no one has written better, or indeed so well, on poetry. He did not pretend to be capable of producing either an epic or a tragedy; but the rules by which he judges both have possessed the force and dignity of laws in every enlightened country for many centuries. No poet worthy of the name pretends to set aside these laws on the ground that the author of them had no right to make them since he was not a poet himself; yet this is the sort of logic which critics like Laharpe bring to bear on Seneca.* They condemn his style, when they cannot condemn his thoughts.

It is very true that his style is not equal to that of Cicero, Livy, or Sallust; yet we are bound to remember that he did not live in the Augustan age. The Latin language had begun to degenerate before he was born; if his latinity is inferior to that of the authors mentioned, so is that of Tacitus and Juvenal; but who fails to admire either on this account? There are many who affect to be greatly dissatisfied with the style of Seneca, who would never have supposed it was defective had not Quintilian, the contemporary and rival of the philosopher, found fault with it. But although Quintilian was evidently jealous of the success and fame of Seneca, he deems it judicious to be cautious in con-

* *Vide Cours de Littérature, tome iii., part ii., p. 163 et seq.*

demning him; and even when he does find fault, he is obliged to admit that his rival has great merits. As his remarks are historical as well as critical, and show that those Roman educators who were not prejudiced availed themselves of the teachings of the philosopher, we transcribe them here:—

"Of Seneca I have purposely delayed to speak, in reference to any department of eloquence, on account of a false report that has been circulated respecting me, from which I was supposed to condemn, and even to hate him. This happened to me while I was striving to bring back our style of speaking, which was spoiled and enervated by every kind of fault, to a more severe standard of taste. At that time Seneca was almost the only writer in the hands of the young. I was not desirous for my own part to set him aside altogether, but I could not allow him to be preferred to those better authors whom he never ceased to attack, since, being conscious that he had adopted a different style from theirs, he distrusted his power of pleasing those by whom they were admired. But his *partisans* rather admired than succeeded in imitating him, and fell as far below him as he had fallen below the older writers. Yet it had been desirable that his followers should have been equal to him, or at least have made near approaches to him; but he attracted them only by his faults, and each of them set himself to copy in him what he could; and then, when they began to boast that they wrote like him, they brought dishonour on his name. Still he had many and great merits; a ready and fertile wit, extraordinary application, and extensive knowledge on various subjects, though he was sometimes deceived by those he had employed to make researches for him. He has written on almost every department of learning: for there are orations of his, and poems, and letters, and dialogues in circulation. In philosophy he was not sufficiently accurate, though an admirable assailant of vices. There are many bright thoughts in him, and much that may be read for moral improvement, but most of his phraseology is in a vitiated taste, and most hurtful to students, for the very reason that it abounds in pleasing faults. We could wish that he had written from his own mind, and under the control of another person's judgment: for if he had rejected some of his thoughts, if he had not fixed his affections on small beauties, if he had not been in love with every thing that he conceived, if he had not weakened the force of his matter by petty attempts at sententiousness, he would have been honoured with the unanimous consent of the learned, rather than the admiration of boys. Yet, such as he is, he ought to be read by those whose judgment is matured, and whose minds have been strengthened by a severer manner of writing, if with no other object than that the reader may exercise his judgment for and against him; for, as I said, there is much in him worthy of approval, and much deserving of admiration; only it must be our care to choose judiciously, as I wish that he himself had done, since natural powers, that could accomplish whatever they pleased, were worthy of having better objects to accomplish."*

The *animus* of the rival is apparent in this throughout. It shows that if Quintilian was accused of hating, or at least, of disliking Seneca, it was not without good reason. The former was by no means pleased to find the

* De Institutione Oratore. Lib. c. 125.

latter preferred to other writers; and, as to the style of Seneca, it is vastly more lucid than that of his critic. The latinity of Seneca is not Augustan, as we have already remarked; but neither is that of Quintilian. The latter is not only the most prosy of all the Latin writers; he is also the most obscure. He has no originality; no warmth; whereas Seneca possesses both in a high degree. Seneca had the same idea of style which he had of dress; he thought that the philosopher, or even the orator, should set but little value on either;* whereas Quintilian depended nearly as much on the choice of words as on the choice of ideas; and yet his language is by no means a model. In addition to this, Diderot reminds us that one was a professor of elocution, the other a professor of philosophy; and that, while one remained a schoolmaster, the other became a prime minister.†

This is quite sufficient to account for the adverse criticisms of Quintilian, at the same time, it would be unjust to deny that education in general, especially oratory, owes much to the author of *De Institutione Oratore*. Far be it from us to say one word in depreciation of so judicious and excellent an instructor; we merely want to show that, although he is, in general, a most impartial critic, it is unfair to judge Seneca by his estimate, since he had a motive to condemn, to which few minds are superior. We are quite as much disposed to vindicate one as the other. Accordingly, we readily admit that Quintilian was more moral in his practice than Seneca; but we hold that the philosopher was a much more profound thinker than the elocutionist; and, that much good as the writings of the latter have done, those of the former have done vastly more.

It must ever be deplored that, for at least a portion of his life, Seneca was licentious; and that, if he was not actually guilty of crime, it is too evident that he was not always actuated in his conduct by honorable motives. But he has made ample amends for his errors in his writings. Whatever mischief he did in his time it was very slight when placed in the balance against the

* "Neatness of style, he says, is no manly ornament." (Non est ornamentum virile cincinnatas.)—*Ep.* cxv.

† Quintilien naquit la seconde année du règne de Claude: alors Sénèque avait quitté le barreau. Celui-ci professa la philosophie, l'autre l'art oratoire. Tous deux furent instituteurs des grands; mais Quintilien resta maître d'école, et Sénèque devint ministre.—*Essai sur la Vie de Sénèque*, par M. Diderot, chap. cvii.

incalculable service which he rendered mankind by his ethics, altogether independently of his philosophy.

ART. II.—1. *History of Rationalism.* By REV. JOHN F. HURST, M. A. New York: Scribner & Co. 1865.

2. *The Church and the Churches.* By Dr. DÖLLINGER. London. 1866.

CHRISTIANITY has now had a sway, complete or imperfect as it may have been, of nineteen centuries, over the fairest and most highly favoured portions of the world. Whether the founders of this religious system had, at first, a clear knowledge of the extent to which the results of their labours were destined to reach, or whether the aspiration to universal conquest grew upon them gradually, as success crowned their efforts, is a point upon which varying opinions may be entertained, even by the most professedly orthodox. The geographical knowledge of the most learned contemporaries of the first apostles, was somewhat limited; nor are we required to believe that these first preachers of the Word, had, by inspiration, or otherwise, any superiority over their neighbours in the acquisition of human science. No authoritative teaching of any Church requires its members to believe that the authentic biographers had the assistance of inspiration in the narration of historical facts, or in the recording of truths not necessary or useful to salvation.

We may safely assert, then, that the apostles, and even Christ himself, regarded as a human being, when speaking of the "whole world," spoke in accordance with common usage around them, and, consequently, what appeared to them to be the whole world, or the "universe," was, in reality, but a portion of it. This might be more clearly shown by referring to the usage of sacred writers antecedent to the Christian epoch, such as may be seen in the prophets, and notably in the Pentateuch. When Tertullian, in the second century, gloried that the Church was known to the ends of the earth, he must have spoken in the same sense, and given his limited knowledge an unlimited expression. It is not very likely, or, at least, it would not be very rash to deny, that the new ideas had been borne to all nations, especially as there were then many countries with pop-

ulous cities and civilized communities entirely unknown. But Tertullian was a rhetorician, and it is not probable that his faith would deny him the modest use of a figure of speech. It is fair to state, then, that the first propagators of the gospel may not have entertained the idea of universal dominion for their religious principles; and, that they were as well satisfied with the progress made by their doctrines in that early period, as the Christians of the present day are content with the result of their own labours to the same end.

Had they equally good grounds to support that feeling of satisfaction? Upon examination, their labours will appear to have partaken largely of that spirit of self-devotion so explicitly recommended in the writings of the first apostles. A more cordial co-operation than that exhibited in the labours of the multifarious forms of Christianity in our day, distinguished the original followers of the Galilean regenerator. Their action was more combined, whilst it enjoyed more unrestricted freedom from conventional rule.

These two qualities must have wonderfully aided in the attainment of success. They evinced less anxiety, and, in fact, had less need to oppose the divergent opinions that began to be developed in the nascent Church, than we witness around us at the present day. Perhaps, too, circumstances lent them better aid. A degeneracy had taken place in the natural civilization which had for ages diffused its influence over the nations of antiquity, and the colossus of the Roman tyranny was about to topple from its own corruption. When, at a later period, the barbarians of the North had shattered to pieces the crumbling mass, they could not help being awed by the majestic ruins, nor could they deny the science of those whom they had enslaved.

Physical force, whilst dominant over mental greatness, must yield ultimately to the invincible superiority of the latter. Since this is the order of nature, whose laws constitute the providence of God, we need not be surprised at the numerous evidences of it in the history of our race in the past, whilst we may with greater confidence rely upon its fuller manifestation in the future. In this principle we may discover a reason which will explain the success that crowned the efforts of Christianity in the first centuries of our era. The advocates of religion pretend, whether wisely or not we do not now discuss, that this success must be ascribed to miraculous

intervention—to supernatural, or, at least, preternatural agency.

No sooner had idolatry fallen, and triumph crowned the general principles of Christianity, than its human elements began to develop themselves in the form of internal discord and external disunion. Men, high in authority, were more desirous of preserving their personal pre-eminence, than of propagating the doctrines of their religion. Even in the Council of Nice, looked upon by all Christians as the first ecumenical assembly, the congregated bishops required the yet unbaptized Constantine, to compel his subjects by physical force to embrace the predominant doctrines decreed in the Council. This example soon became universal in the Church, and from that remote period, down to the past century, we are presented with the edifying spectacle of Christians using the fervid arguments of fire and sword, in order to convince each other of true Christian virtue.

This spirit is, however, but feebly represented in the present age. That there are still some who would too willingly lend a hand in piling up the stake to test the obstinacy of a dissenting brother, cannot be denied by any person who has taken the pains to learn the secret wishes of some religionists. But, in our opinion, the time for such arguments has passed away, never to return; and the only persuasion that can henceforth be effective in propagating religious doctrines, must be grounded on reason and charity. This is nothing more than reverting to the too often neglected teaching of the divine Founder of Christianity. The religious party that ignores this truth, and adheres to antiquated notions of intolerance and domination by forcible means, is but an obstruction to its own aspirations—clogging the wheels of its own progress, and drying up the fountains of sympathy between itself and advancing humanity.

These brief considerations, necessarily prefatory to what we have to say, will lead us to view the most prominent features which the Christian world of the present day presents to us. We must confine our judgment to the external form, indeed, although from this we may frequently divine the internal spirit. But as not even the Catholic Church pretends to judge the internal life of her own members, much less do we presume to pass judgment upon the spirit of any denomination, or of any individual. We can only judge that of which we have cognizance, and which is subject to our perception.

The first thing that will strike an impartial observer, and produce impressions for which he could not be expected to have been prepared, is the disunion, the discord, or the domestic hostility between the different bodies that call themselves Christians. More than this, there appears between them an antipathy wholly irreconcilable with the clearest maxim of their common Master. If there is an expression upon whose meaning there can be no theological quibbling, it is that in which his followers are told to "love one another." Hermeneutists can find but one meaning in these words, nor can exegetists discover more than one *sense*. Yet, has there been a principle more rigorously pursued by the different denominations than that of hostility to each other?

It sometimes appears that there is amongst them a stronger desire to combat or secretly thwart the designs of a rival body, than to forward their own interests. Are there not cases—we hope exceptional—in which the aim of one party is directed to spoil the prospects, or ruin the projects of another, rather than aid or wish success to the missionary enterprises of its neighbour? A noble emulation in good is commendable, but a spirit of opposition to the works of another, because of another, is disreputable. This is more unaccountable in Christian bodies when we consider the action of their Master in a similar case. His disciples brought him word upon one occasion, that other men were doing good works in his name, without his express commission. Far from approving of his disciples' jealousy, he forbade them to interfere, and approved the works of the strangers.

Although we judge that his spirit is not the most prominent feature in his modern disciples, our remarks here are rather suggestive than otherwise, as we desire those interested to draw their own conclusions. Our view is that the internal discord and external hostility between the various branches of Christianity within the last three hundred years, have been highly injurious to its efficiency, and an impediment to the propagation of its principles among heathen nations.

Moreover, this discordance and unfriendly spirit have been productive of disastrous consequences to the Christian body at large, with respect to its own standing in the light of the present age. It is not too much to say—for it is patent to the eyes of every thinking man who wishes to see it—that the bonds by which the interests of religion and civil society might be expected to be now drawn

closely together, have, on the contrary, become strained, and, to some extent, dissevered more than is well for either. There is a wide-spread feeling of dissociation, if not a threatened total disruption, between the secular elements of modern social life, and what is regarded as the religious element.

This is more so in Europe than in our own country. Religious criticism and religious discussion have gone farther in advance in the old seats of Christianity than with us; although there is an undeniably rapid progress in imitation of the same springing up around us, and even boldly mounting into pulpits most stiffly conservative. The ultimate effects of this powerful current of human thought, it is not for us to predict; we are more particularly concerned with its immediate results. One of these, and not the least important, is the gradual removal of many old landmarks which were fondly believed to have indicated the limits of human science. The strong tendency to which we have alluded above, *i.e.*, of separating the secular from the religious elements of social life, or of ignoring the supernatural in any restricted sense, and taking cognizance only of the natural, must be chiefly owing to the internal dissension and consequent weakness superinduced by the domestic strife for which Christian polemics have been, and still are, the field.

A Christian maxim, of no difficulty to comprehend, says that "a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand." If this be true, those who profess the deepest interest in the Christian republic may find much to disturb their dreams of universality in the present state of the various churches, divided and indefinitely subdivided as they are. If this process of disintegration continue—and we see no satisfactory reason to think it may cease—what hope can the future hold out to even the most ardent zealot? We are aware that a few enlightened believers take another view of this phase of their religion, and, instead of regarding it with feelings of regret, deem it a natural, if not a necessary consequence of Christian principles, and one, moreover, highly desirable, because highly beneficial. As this is the opinion of only a few, it cannot be looked upon as of much importance; it is by no means prevalent to any respectable extent. There being an indescribable variety of doctrines in Christianity, it is certain that there is no one doctrine of all these not denied by members of the Christian body.

In mechanics, a system of forces acting in combination will produce a result that cannot be obtained from the same forces separately applied, much less if acting in opposite directions. Now it appears very clear to us that this same principle is at work in the moral world. The long-standing and apparently irreconcilable divisions of the Christian body impair its efficiency in the conversion of nations not yet regenerate, whilst the incomprehensible confusion, the disorder, the contradictions in which it is so prolific, weaken the intelligent faith of its own members, and depend very much upon zeal and enthusiasm. This, however, is but one characteristic of that religion which has given a name and civilization to Christendom. With what it has done in the past we are not now concerned. With its present influence upon men and nations we are occupied; and although there are many things in it that strike us as inexplicable, we shall endeavour to express our views of its various forms so far as they are intelligible to us.

It is not without a feeling somewhat akin to humiliation that a Christian can bring home to his mind the fact that his religion is professed only by a moiety of the human race; and this, too, after its long existence in the world. There are more Buddhists than all Christians put together. That these heathen are more sincere in their belief, and more faithful in the practice of their religious tenets than are Christians, it would not be rash to assert, and it would be difficult to disprove. This, of course, does not imply that we defend the degradation to which, undoubtedly, heathenism reduces its devotees, or that we compare it with Christianity. We only compare the subjective sincerity of the professors of the different forms of belief.

We are convinced that the doctrines of Christianity are sufficiently profound to afford ample field for the subtlest research of the highest intellect, and we know that they have been accepted by men of the first order of genius. This nobody can venture to affirm of the irrational postulates or incredible riddles of Brahminism or its kindred sects, which must be regarded as the highest type of heathenism. The advocates of Christianity have always had amongst them some of the noblest exemplars of the human mind, both in natural powers and in cultivation. Her most enlightened champions have made it their especial care to teach that the most abstruse mysteries of faith are in harmony with natural

reason, and contain nothing contradictory to well-established principles of natural science. It is only the crude conjectures of some modern sciolists that Christianity reprehends. And it is only with exceptional mystics or extravagant supernaturalists, not recognized as exponents of any, but occupying the extreme outskirts of every creed, that the irreconcilability of Christian doctrine and natural human science, in its most advanced, approved state, is maintained. Notwithstanding all this prestige of being the acknowledged cause of our civilization and freedom, it is not altogether satisfactory to think that the diffusion of Christianity over the earth has not been more complete, and is not now triumphant over all systems of religion having a different origin.

The Mahometan creed retains its sway over the minds of extensive Asiatic and African populations once believers in Christian revelation, which they exchanged for the visions of Mahomet. These are, at least, as firm in their devotion to the Crescent, as are Christians to the Cross. China, Hindostan, and other densely populated regions, adhere to their unyielding idolatry, without being greatly influenced either by a copious distribution of Bibles by Protestant, or the prodigal effusion of blood by martyred Catholic missionaries. Even at our own doors, in face of our westward advancing civilization, uncouth idolatry squats undisturbed, more likely to give way to the shriek of the locomotive than to the voice of the missionary. If, then, Protestants fail to make their lavishly distributed money and Bibles an effective means of diffusing belief in mysterious doctrines upon whose intelligence they are not themselves entirely agreed: and if Catholics cannot, by their well-known means of self-sacrifice, attain the same end, it is not easy to foresee the definite period at which the world shall be wholly Christian.

Although there is an evident discrepancy between the proclaimed efforts to spread the gospel and the results of these efforts, it must not be supposed that Christianity is inoperative in modern society. Without entering upon the nature and the doctrines of our religion, we cannot omit to state briefly, that it is a civilization as well as a worship. It has not been ordained to lead men to a future state, otherwise than in a human, rational manner. Civilization is the practical completion and elevation of the intellectual powers of man, over the grosser portions of material nature. Christianity has civilization for its object as much as it has the inculcation of a spirit of reverence

and submission to the Deity. It must even civilize before it can teach to worship.

To suppose that there can be a Christian without a proper knowledge of the Great Cause of all things, of his own nature and destiny, and some of those natural truths upon which Christianity is based, would be absurd. Yet there are not a few mystics in all creeds, who seem incapable to admit this. Thus they would destroy all harmony between the natural and the supernatural, by placing between them an impassable abyss, over whose obscurity humanity could never find a way, even guided by the Divinity. The natural and supernatural have the same origin—they arise from the same cause—the creative act of God. By regarding Christianity as hostile or repugnant to the principles of nature, particularly of man's nature, instead of harmonizing the natural and supernatural, the secular and the religious, by a synthetic act, there arises that dangerous dissociation, which has gone so far to estrange the sympathies of modern life from the old faith.

Rather than enter into general principles, illustrating this state of things, we place before our readers a statement or two from the works placed at the head of this article.

Mr. Hurst has been industrious in collecting much useful information regarding the state of feeling in the Protestant world, whilst Dr. Döllinger, has shown a much more extensive acquaintance with his kindred subject. They both profess orthodoxy, but of a different stamp. Mr. Hurst does not make it clear, in any one line of his six hundred and twenty-three pages, what name belongs to the type of orthodox religion whose claims to truth he asserts, against the assaults of rationalism; whilst Dr. Döllinger leaves no room to doubt his uncompromising, but liberal and enlightened advocacy of all the prerogatives of the Catholic Church in any page of his work. As Mr. Hurst, however, is quite laudative of "the Church," and does not maintain the peculiar dogmas of Catholics, we suppose him to represent the Protestant Church, though to which branch of it he clings it is impossible to divine.

This, however, we say hesitatingly, well knowing, that of the countless denominations of which Protestantism may justly boast, none would be willing to abide by the interpretation of a rival sect. And, that few Protestants would to-day admit Mr. Hurst's opinions, we are convinced, when we discover that he holds (as we intimated

above to be held by exceptional individuals of all creeds), that "the spirit of Christianity is so totally at variance with that of the world, that it is in vain to expect harmony between them." (Introd., p. 5.) What he means by the "unsanctified reason of man" (Ibid.) is not easy to comprehend. To ascribe evil opinions to anybody, is no congenial occupation, but we cannot help the suspicion that here enters our mind, and inclines us to fear that Mr. Hurst would establish a dualism in this world of ours, not unlike Manichæism,—a doctrine fatally pernicious, and calculated to dissever enlightened minds from all sympathy with revelation, on account of a falsely interpreted Christianity.

The antagonism supposed to exist between "the spirit of Christianity and that of the world," upon whose imaginary prevalence so many clergymen dilate, is more specious than real, and arises from a strange ignoring of history. It is indeed true, that Christ spoke of the "world," as if in opposition to him and his doctrine. But it was the world of his day, the unregenerate, uncivilized, unchristianized world; not as it is now, glorying in the enlightenment, freedom, and love, which have been introduced by Christian *principles*, if not by Christian *men*. Those who use the term as Mr. Hurst does in his book, transport themselves back to the days of Paganism, when the world was indeed corrupt, degraded by barbarous customs, and enslaved by idolatrous opinions; when human reason might be figuratively considered "unsanctified," because darkened by prejudice, which had usurped its throne over the actions of men and the life of society. If premises are changed, it is not logical to hold their conclusions unchangeable, and certainly the nineteenth century has a different aspect from that of the first. There is great injury inflicted upon the Christian cause, by the widely extended croaking over a supposed antagonism between its doctrines and the principles of the world, as the world presents itself to our eyes. Those who believe in such antipathy ought to abandon a world which they find irreconcilable with their profession, for they look upon Christianity as synonymous with monasticism, and have much in common with the troglodytes of ancient Egypt.

It is no wonder that Rationalism, against which Mr. Hurst tilts, makes head against revelation, supported on such a sandy foundation as that on which he would have us believe it erected. To say that "Rationalists" "were

possessed by the evil spirit" (Introd., p. 34), that "they corrupted nearly all the land (Germany) for several generations, until to-day the humblest peasant (from the land of Luther), who steps on our shores at Castle Garden, will stare in wonder, as you speak of a final judgment, the immortality of the soul, and the authenticity of the Scriptures" (Ib.), is not easily reconciled with what precedes, i. e. : "the great Coryphæi of Rationalism have sprung from the very bosom of the Church (Protestant), were educated under her maternal care, . . . were in the eyes of the people its strongest pillars, the accredited spiritual guides of the land, . . . preaching in the churches which had been hallowed by the struggles and triumphs of the Reformation," (p. 27). Moreover, "German Protestantism cannot complain that this was the work of acknowledged foes; but is bound to confess, with confusion of face, that it has been produced by her own sons." (Ib.)

Candour is a quality always commendable; but, although Mr. Hurst frankly admits these unpleasant facts, it is more than probable that he takes but a very partial and superficial view of the question, and does not go deep enough to discover the real cause of this eradication of Christianity in Protestant Germany. And first, the method of thought which he himself has adopted in placing Revelation above, if not contrary to human reason, is more pernicious, and has been more fatal to Christian mysteries than any Rationalistic efforts could possibly be. Any religious system that requires a man to believe in dogmas that are contrary to his reason, cannot have the Divinity for its author. God is the author of natural reason, and those mystics who suppose an All-wise Being dispensing a new revelation opposed or contradictory to the dictates of his previous work, are, in reality, guilty of the impious act by which his wisdom is assailed. Far more injurious to supernaturalism, are the irrational sophisms by which God is made to contradict himself, than the attacks of candid and avowed Rationalists.

If Christian revelation has a divine origin, its claims will be but feebly advanced by a method of reasoning that would destroy the harmony of creation. True Christianity does not require us to believe that human nature has become totally depraved, or that our reason, even in its unregenerate state, cannot discover by its own native powers some of the principal and essential doctrines un-

derlying Christianity, and without which Christianity were no better than Buddhism, or any other system foisted upon the credulity of mankind by superstition and ignorance. Sound philosophy teaches that our reason is infallible in its own sphere, and, as an eminent writer has said: "Reason never leads us astray, but reasoning does." Our judgment errs because we are illogical. We accept false premises, or from true ones deduce, by defective method, false conclusions. This is not the fault of our reason in itself; it must be attributed to our want of accuracy, or to our prejudices, which so often sway our better judgment. From the Pagan philosophers this appears very satisfactorily. Aristotle reached by his natural reason some of the most sublime truths of revelation. The unity and eternity of God, his creatorship and his providence were clearly taught by him. St. Thomas follows up and elaborates, by the same rational process, the system of Christian belief and ethics, which has had such influence in determining the Christianity of the past six centuries. The great Stagyrte died praying: "*Causa causarum, miserere mei*;" and it is said that in the Middle Ages—when human reason is falsely supposed to have been held in low esteem—so highly was he, its representative, honoured, that his name was inserted in a litany of saints, under the invocation, "*Sancle Aristotele, ora pro nobis*." In our day he would have but a slight chance of salvation amongst the depreciators of human nature, who pretend to mete out future happiness according to their whim. All this, however, we say in order to express very fully our belief, that those who are eager to ignore or depress reason in order to elevate revelation—who think they serve the supernatural by removing it entirely beyond, or making it appear incompatible with the natural, are really working for the demolition of both, proving what Christ said: "A man's enemies are those of his own household," and amongst whom we cannot help numbering Rev. Mr. Hurst, although his History of Rationalism is undoubtedly an interesting work.

Whether a member of one denomination can give an impartial account of his own creed, or take an unprejudiced view of another, is not very easy to decide. Certain it is that we but rarely meet with any religious work entirely free from undue bias; and so common is this belief, that we are always inclined to suspect the exposition which one man gives of his neighbour's different profession.

We know that Dr. Döllinger does not accord in every

thing with the opinions of the great body of his co-religionists in all their domestic questions. It is very true that the difference between them exists only respecting non-essential points—matters of discipline, political views and opinions regarding the policy of the Church in its human organization. There is no difference, we believe, between Catholics in matters of doctrine or faith; but there is an extensive field given over to *opinion*, and although there is not everywhere the same latitude enjoyed for the expression of divergent views, there is always the utmost freedom given to the interior assent to or dissent from propositions not of faith. And we always find the more highly educated members of the Catholic priesthood to be the most liberal in according to all the liberty which their Church does not deny them.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to detect in Dr. Döllinger's work any design to treat unfairly the question he examines. He appears to place a higher value upon truth, for truth's sake, than for the furtherance of party interest. This, because rare among sects, is all the more precious. In fact, his boldness and independence in combating opinions held by a majority of members in his own communion, is a guaranty of his fairness to other denominations. As an instance, we may cite his views of the temporal power of the Pope. He unhesitatingly declares his belief in the necessity of a change of policy in this matter, and intimates that a union of the two powers, temporal and spiritual, in one person, is an obstacle to the progress of the Church at the present day, and unequivocally demands a change in its programme in this respect.

In concluding his work he says: "We will not cling to what is transitory and accidental; we will not desire that any people shall be constrained to accept what we ourselves would not bear; we will not stand up for a false system of government which is, in fact, not more than forty-five years old, and the deficiencies of which the Pope himself has acknowledged, and which, in the course of that time, has generated nothing but discontent and revolt among the majority of the people. He who will support himself on such a staff, when the staff has already become rotten, must run the risk of falling to the ground"—(p. 474).

The man who expresses such sentiments in the face of the evident majority of his fellow-believers, thinking, or at least speaking, very strongly on the other side, must

have sufficient love of truth to give a candid examination to the doctrines of other denominations ; unless we should believe with Gibbon, that the virtues of the clergy are more to be feared than their vices. Long as we have been acquainted with Protestant doctrines, and studious as we have been of Catholic principles, we have found much to learn concerning both in the writings of Döllinger. He does not fear the spirit of the present age, nor does he hesitate to trust in the future. Instead of combating the legitimate aspirations of human reason, he professes himself an ardent advocate of its claims in every sphere of science. It is true, indeed, that he has had opposition to his views strongly expressed by a certain party in the conservative church, to whose decrees he yields unswerving adhesion. This is, of course, but natural ; and he who does not meet with contradiction may be generally put down as undeserving of approbation. He has never been censured by any authority in his communion, although he owed his escape from condemnation to the wise intervention of his friend, the learned Theiner, librarian of the Vatican.

Our age has many demands to make upon those who live and labour under its progressive inspiration. Although we cordially believe that human happiness and enlightenment have never been so far advanced in general as at the present day, there is nothing to which we look with a sense of more profound pleasure than the spirit of liberality and forbearance which is gradually pervading the religious world. This we cannot help ascribing to a more truthful appreciation of the real Christian spirit, and the more generally it announces itself from the pulpit, the brighter must grow the prospects of Christianity.

It is not easy to see the wisdom of some classes of clergymen whose chief aim is to decry the present age, and declaim against the unruly spirit manifest (to their eyes) in the impulses of the times. Many see nought but ruin in the goal to which humanity, in its longings after freedom and knowledge, at present tends. This, indeed, should not be surprising in those who look to the past as the best and purest epochs of Christian faith, who have no confidence in the present, and who dread the destinies of the future. To them the Christian light which illumined the darkness of barbarous times, and shed some lustre upon the dreariness of the Middle Ages, is now but flickering, soon, perhaps, to be totally extinguished. Many

such are to be met with, pretending to be the only true expositors of Christianity. But the world heedlessly, or contemptuously passes them by, and moves with its never ceasing changes, whirling into existence revolutionary blessings, never returning to collect the fragments of shattered conservatism, and never rebuilding what it has battered down in its course. This we see daily more clearly illustrated in political organisms ; and religion, in its evidently human constituents, without interfering with what is divine in its constitution, must also acknowledge the same providential principle. Nothing human is stable, but humanity itself, its accidental forms, its states and institutions must undergo unceasing change.

In commending what is just and laudable in the characteristics of our age, there is no need to approve every thing that crops out under the plausible guise of progress and enlightenment. It is clear that abuse is incidental to every form of good which we may enjoy. Hence, amidst all our justly boasted advancement, there are some things that cannot attract our sympathy, because the name of liberty is often applied to that which is mere libertinism, and many who most loudly proclaim themselves in the vanguard of progress, are really those who would drag back the human race into a state more deplorable than any form of barbarism from which it has emerged.

Whilst religion proclaims the sublime doctrines that guide to another and higher state of existence, it need not make war upon the legitimate aspirations of that civilization which it has ushered into life. Whatever form of Christianity teaches incomprehensible or irrational dogmas can hardly look with hope into the coming generations. If men are required to give credence to formularies that deny us the entirety of our rational faculties, they will not accept with intelligence or sincerity such formularies. If we are taught that human nature is essentially corrupt, and remains so even after a necessary mystic regeneration by sacramental agency, we cannot have faith in that contradiction of reason. If we are called upon to believe that no human being is capable of performing a virtuous act, or any thing but sin, even after the same mysterious rite, without a superadded efficacy as a gift from heaven, we hesitate before admitting such a proposition, even though accredited to us by the venerableness of age or by the predilections of prejudice. If we have due respect for our religious belief, we must regard it as having been intended for rational beings and presentable on rational grounds.

The Rationalistic movement did not originate in the past or present century. It may have attained a more scientific development, and assumed a more cautious course by endeavouring to assimilate its theories with Christology and the Bible interpreted upon principles purely rational and human. But its efforts were contemporaneous with Christianity from the beginning. There has been always in the Church a party inquisitive and searching as well as giving reasons for belief, and there has also been another party believing without reasoning, and denying to others the privilege of reasoning in order to believe reasonably. The Pelagius of the fourth, and Erigena, of the twelfth century, as well as the unfortunate Abelard, have not been surpassed in the boldness of their speculations by any Rationalist of the present day.

But the skeptical spirit of our times in regard to what claims an incomprehensibly supernatural origin, will not stop with the repressive tendency which would crush, without satisfying, its longings. Christianity claiming direct communication with the divine mind—the source and light of all rational existence, and the very Being which is seen in all things, and through which all things are seen—cannot deny itself to be in harmony with human reason. The party that would place it in dissociation from the other works of God, and unapproachable by our intellect, is really aiming at its annihilation. On the other hand, those who look upon it as a purely human organization are sapping its foundations. Reason admitted into religion within rational bounds, must be the great bulwark of Revelation. Instead of battering down the edifice it will prop it up, injured as it is already by the sophistries of a repulsive mysticism, which arose from the same source of human folly, as that which gave birth to the barbarous superstition of Paganism.

A revelation wholly unintelligible to reason were absurd. This, too, is the doctrine of the great Church which claims universality, although individual members practically ignore it. Many of our modern religionists are adverse to such an idea, and hence the discordant clashing of creeds that spring up around us, each claiming a superior excellence and approving itself, not to reason, but to sentimentalism or sensationalism.

As Christianity may not yet have assumed its purest form, so its destiny may not have yet been accomplished for this world. Ages of splendour await its triumph over

the imperfect forms, in which its divine nature has been invested by its mortal and fallible recipients. This triumph may be accelerated by correspondence with its sacred principles, or retarded by nonconformity with its pure doctrines. The accidental, the temporary, the transitory may shift and vary, as it evidently has done in its historic progress, but the immutable spirit and undying truth ever advancing the welfare and enlightenment of our race, shall ultimately put on the brilliant garb in which perfect religion will beautify the nations. This will happen when worship and civilization—its twofold object—shall have attained their climax on the scene of this world.

ART. III.—1. *Historical Disquisition on the Game of Chess.* By DAINES BARRINGTON. London.

2. *Le Palamède ; Revue Mensuelle.* Paris.

3. *The Chess-Player's Handbook.* By HOWARD STAUNTON. London.

4. *Encyclopædia des Echecs, &c.* Par M. ALEXANDRE. Paris.

THE influence of habit is more potent for good or evil than even the most thoughtful generally suppose, and it is almost needless to say, that in proportion as a habit is attractive its power increases. In youth it is so great that few can entirely emancipate themselves from its control. And experience shows but too plainly that it is not what is most useful that is most attractive, but generally the reverse. Far be it from us to maintain, however, that we should have utility in view in all our actions; we would not have the bow always bent, but would allow it sufficient relaxation. No one who understands physiology is opposed to rational amusement; we require no sages to assure us that it produces a salutary effect on both mind and body.

It should be remembered, at the same time, that amusement, like many other things that are useful and good in moderation, becomes a vice when carried to excess. This is particularly true of the kind of amusement afforded by gaming in any form. Nor does chess-playing form an exception. We are quite aware that by finding fault with chess we shall displease many; but it is precisely because such large numbers devote so much of their valuable time to that game at the present day that we take up the subject for discussion. Did we consult our own interests, we

would praise the improved tastes of the increasing thousands who devote so large a proportion of their time to the chess-board ; we would say that more is to be learned from it than from the best books, and that, accordingly, those who attend our libraries or reading-rooms had better take up the chess-board than any printed volume, ancient or modern. Nor should we confine ourselves to this ; we should regard a chess victory as of greater importance than any discovery in chemistry or astronomy.

Instead of all this, however, we take the liberty of thinking that the prevailing passion for chess-playing in this country at the present moment, is not at all creditable to our civilization. But let us not be misunderstood. We do not think there is any harm in playing a game of chess ; we should think nothing the less of a gentleman or lady for playing a game occasionally. But when we see one or the other occupied at the chess-board from five to eight hours daily, or nightly, we cannot help thinking that there is something wrong ; and we think the aspect of the case grows worse when the devotees of the game are not only permitted to fritter away their time in this way at our public libraries and reading-rooms, but are afforded every inducement to prefer playing to reading.

We confess that we have seldom been more surprised than we have at a recent sight of this kind. It would be invidious to mention the public library to which we allude, since we find it is by no means peculiar in that respect, although perhaps in no similar institution could we find so large a number of persons engaged for hours in playing chess ; and for every one that played there were at least half a dozen of lookers-on who seemed to be very nearly if not quite as much excited by the progress of the game as the players themselves. But to us the worst feature of the scene was that three-fourths of those thus occupied were youths ; quite a considerable portion were students or school-boys, who found it much more agreeable to play chess than to study either science or language. Although we have taken some pains to ascertain the fact, it is almost superfluous to say that they are by no means the best or most intelligent students, who are the most skilful chess-players, but almost universally the reverse. The one who gains the most victories on the chess-board is pretty sure to be a bad translator, nor is he much more likely to be above the bottom of his class in mathematics, much stress as the votaries of the game lay on its quasi scientific character.

Yet if we are correctly informed—and we have no reason to doubt the veracity of our correspondents—the game has been introduced into many of our colleges and academies. We certainly have never seen students playing chess in any college or seminary, although we have visited many and been afforded opportunities in several instances of making ourselves familiar with the personal habits and tastes of the students. But the same is true of billiard playing; we have never to this day seen the game played in any literary institution. For this reason we refused to believe that it was one of the sciences upon which most attention was bestowed at certain institutions. At worst, thought we, the students play an occasional game in some dark corner of the college; surely the faculty would not connive at what all must admit to be a species of gaming; much less would it encourage it. We persisted in taking this view of the case until we saw it proved beyond all question, that the worst we had heard on the subject was but too true. Nay, the worst remained to be proclaimed through the public journals by the professors themselves, who in their devotion to the game forgot, as our readers may remember, that there were some of the parents and guardians of those placed in their charge to be educated, who might prefer some other science to that of billiard playing. But were it necessary to choose between billiards and chess, as a branch of college study alternating with theology and the humanities, we certainly would recommend the former game before the latter on account of the physical exercise it affords.

It is curious enough that one of the principal arguments in favour of making all the rising generation chess-players is that the game is very ancient. We cheerfully admit that it is; nay, we will take occasion to show that it is of a higher antiquity than the most zealous of its admirers have the hardihood to claim. In the mean time we may remark, that if we were to adopt a habit, or practice, merely because it was popular some hundreds or even thousands of years ago, we should adopt a good many. If we ought to play chess because the ancient Greeks and Romans, and even the Egyptians and Hindoos, did so, ought we not also, in order to be consistent, do many other things which the same nations did? The ancients worshipped a great many gods and goddesses; sometimes they worshipped the most loathsome of the lower animals. This may, therefore, be regarded as highly

classical; but ought we revive the practice on that account.*

We now proceed to inquire how ancient the game of chess is, but we do not do so for the purpose of finding any argument either against the practice of the game at the present day, or in favour of it, but simply as we would take up any other historical subject, and make such remarks upon it as we might deem interesting to our readers, bearing in mind that there are many things useless in themselves, or merely imaginary, which it may not only be agreeable but instructive to discuss.

Chess-players in general are content to trace back the game of chess to the Greeks. There is no doubt that the Greeks were acquainted with it; but so far as can be inferred from any record of the subject, they were by no means the best class of the Greeks who practised the game. So early as Homer's time chess was played, but generally if not invariably by those who had nothing more useful to occupy their minds. We have an interesting illustration of this in the case of the idle persons who had no more noble object than to seduce the good and virtuous Penelope from her allegiance to her husband, evidently not because they had any love for a matron of her time of life, but because the wife of Ulysses had an estate which was worth possessing. It seems their habit was to sit on the skins of oxen before the door of Penelope's palace, passing the time in playing chess. We think we see them now in the spirited picture drawn of them by Homer:—

Εἶπε δ' ἄρα μνηστήρας ἀγένορας* οἳ μὲν ἔπειτα
Πηλοῖσιν προπαροῦθε θυράων θυμὸν ἑτέρπον,
"Ἥμενοι ἐν βινύσιν βῶν, οὗς ἔκτανον αὐτοί.†

The character of the party is sufficiently described by the poet in the two words *μνηστήρας ἀγένορας*, which, being

* There is an institution in the interior of New Jersey, which we are informed has established a "chair," or at least a stool for chess, because the faculty think it *aristocratic* as well as useful. It is true that the establishment alluded to is called a *college* only by courtesy; and that if it teaches chess no better than it does other sciences, or even the English language, not to mention Greek or Latin, its chess graduates will not gain many victories in their mimic battles. It is recorded of Philip II., of Spain, that he rewarded a famous chess-player with the mitre for his skill in a certain victory that he gained, but we would not advise the President of the Jersey school to which we allude, to calculate too confidently on a reward of this kind, for we have to add that the Pope refused to recognize the new bishop. The judgment of his Holiness was very brief, but not the less final:—"Bovus aleator domivus, fortasse, est, sed pessimus episcopus." "The gentleman is a good gamester perhaps, but a very bad bishop."

† Od., l., 107.

freely translated into our vernacular, would mean "impudent loafers," and as such were they treated by Ulysses. Incensed at their base conduct, the hero attacked a whole mob of them, and with only the aid of his son and two servants, killed all.*

This is the most ancient mention we have in Greek literature of the game of chess, or its votaries; and it is difficult to see that it confers any glory on either. Plato alludes to the game in his *Phædra*; and we infer from a line in *Sophocles* that the game was invented by *Palamedes*. Several of the Roman writers speak of the game, especially *Ovid*† and *Martial*;‡ but even the author of the *Art of Love* was not much enamoured of the game.

As for the moralists and philosophers, they have denounced it as a vice, and as such the satirists have ridiculed those who were addicted to it. "I cautiously avoid a proud guest," says *Juvenal*, "who compares me with himself, and looks with scorn upon my paltry estate. Consequently, I don't possess a single ounce of ivory; neither my *chess-board* nor my men are of this material; nay, the very handles of my knives are of bone. Yet my viands never become rank in flavour by these; nor does my pullet cut up the worse on that account."§

A little further on in the same satire, the poet ranks gaming of all kinds among the worst vices, and suggests that there are other diversions much more suitable for intelligent men and women than games of any kind. "Gaming is disgraceful," he says, "and so is adultery in men of moderate means. Yet when rich men commit all these abominations they are called jovial, splendid fellows. Our banquet to-day will furnish *far different amusements. The author of the Iliad shall be recited and the majestic strains of Virgil. What matter is it with what voice such noble verses are read?*"||

This shows what the cultivated Pagans thought on the

* *Od.*, lib. xxii., 385. † *Trist.*, ii., 477; xvi., 20. ‡ See also *Seneca*, *Epit.* 107.

§

Adeo nulla uncia nobis
Est eboris, nec tessellæ, nec calculus ex hac
Materia; quin ipsa manubria cultellorum
Ossea.—*Sat.* xi., v. 132.

||

Alia turpis,
Turpe et adulterium mediocribus: hæc eadem illi
Omnia quum faciant, hilares nitidique vocantur.
Nostra dabunt alio hodie convivia ludos:
Conditor *Iliados* cantabitur, atque *Maronis*
Altisoni dubiam facientia carmina palmam.—*Sat.* xi., v. 174.

subject; and we, in passing, ask our presidents of colleges and superintendents of libraries whether they were right or wrong?

It is certain that neither among the Greeks nor among the Romans did the more thoughtful and educated class occupy their time in chess-playing. The game was played by the middle and lower classes, and by the wealthy, whose chief object, like that of the "shoddy" gentry of our own day, was to kill time.

Nor has the experience of modern times been different, as we will presently show. Sometimes, indeed, kings and emperors have played chess, but have not those personages done many other things which did no service to themselves or their subjects? Before making any inquiry into the character of the sovereigns who are mentioned by the votaries of chess, as having honoured the game by their practice, we will say a word or two more of its antiquity, if only to gratify those who are so proud when they happen to checkmate an antagonist.

Archæologists are pretty generally of opinion at the present day that Egyptian civilization is more ancient than Hindoo civilization. The colossal tombs of Egypt are doubtless the most ancient monuments now extant in a form sufficiently well preserved to enable us to regard them as a criterion of the civilization of those who built them, and the paintings on several of these represent persons employed in playing chess. But it will be sufficient to refer to one. There is a painting on a papyrus, taken in 1852, from one of those tombs, in the Museum of Antiquities at Leyden, which represents a man as playing alone with all the paraphernalia of the game before him. This is supposed by the best judges to be two thousand years old; but several of the mural paintings representing the same game are at least a thousand years older; yet no older, be it observed, than those which represent different other games, including ball-playing, hurling, hide-and-go-seek, &c., &c.

Among the most learned English writers on the subject of chess are Hyde, Barrington, and Sir William Jones. Hyde and Sir William, concur in giving the honour of priority to the Hindoos, from whom, they tell us, the Persians adopted the game nearly six hundred years before our era.* There was no better authority in his time on Hindoo affairs than Sir William Jones, who

* *Vide* Historia Shahiludû apud Syntagma Dissertationum, &c.

fully corroborates the views of Hyde. "If evidence were required," he says, "to prove this fact [the Hindoo origin of the game], we may be satisfied with the testimony of the Persians, who though as much inclined as other nations to appropriate the ingenious inventions of a foreign people, unanimously agree that the game was imported from the west of India in the sixth century of our era. It seems to have been immemorially known to Hindoostans by the name of *Chaturanga*, that is, the four angas, or members of an army; which are these, elephants, horses, chariots, and foot soldiers; and in this sense the word is frequently used by epic poets in their descriptions of real armies."^{*}

Daines Barrington is equally decided in claiming the honour of the invention for the Chinese; and it must be admitted that he adduces plausible if not conclusive arguments in support of his views.[†] He was well acquainted with the researches of both Hyde and Sir William Jones; he treats both much better than antagonists treat each other generally. At the same time, he shows pretty clearly that both are wrong; but if the monuments of Egypt possess the antiquity which is now almost universally ascribed to them by antiquaries, Barrington himself is also wrong. Mr. Eyles Irwin, who spent many years in China, comes to the aid of Barrington, maintaining, in a letter to the Earl of Charlemont, that there is a Chinese manuscript which shows that the game was invented by King Kianguan, three hundred and seventy-nine years after the time of Confucius, nearly two thousand years ago. Assuming that this is a genuine manuscript, and that the game was known to the Chinese at this remote period, we should, nevertheless, consider the Egyptian claim of priority the best founded.

The justice of this will be the more apparent if we bear in mind that in point of fact, the Egyptians make no claim; they allow their works to speak for them. In other words, the Egyptian race—those who built the pyramids—entirely disappeared many centuries ago. They are as completely extinct as the Chaldeans or the Phœnicians, although their stupendous monuments may be expected to endure as long as the earth itself. But it is different with the Hindoos as well as the Chinese. Both are essentially the same races to-day, respectively, they

^{*} Asiatic Researches, vol. ii., p. 120.

[†] Vide Archaeologia, vol. ix.

were two or three thousand years ago. Each has the same religion, and nearly the same manners and customs ; it is natural, therefore, that they should be anxious to claim for their ancestors the invention of whatever they think calculated to show that they were an ingenious people.

At first sight, it might be inferred from these various researches, theories, and hypotheses, that the game of chess must be an important affair, but this by no means follows. Many a grave and learned treatise has been written on fairies and genii, both in the East and in the West, although scarcely any believe any longer that such beings as either ever existed. That the writing of elaborate works on any thing is no proof of its utility, but often the reverse, is easily proved. Thus, for example, all civilized countries regard war as a calamity, but there is no subject upon which more is written. None can pretend that the plague is useful or respectable ; yet vastly more has been written upon it than upon chess or any other game. So much, then, for the argument that if chess were not a useful, honorable, and aristocratic study, so much would not have been written upon it.

But let us give some particulars as to the class of persons who admire chess. It is certain, as we have already seen, that the higher orders of intellect have never been addicted to the game. Some great geniuses have, indeed, tried it, but soon shunned it as a pernicious vice. The greatest of English philosophers have given it some attention ; the author of the *Novum Organum* was induced by some friends to learn chess, but he found it was "too wise a game," and that he should choose between being a great chess-player and a great philosopher. Sir Walter Scott shunned the game for a similar reason, declaring that "one might learn another language in a shorter time, and with less strain on the mind than he could learn the game of chess." He thought that at best those who indulged in it made bad use of their time ; and who will deny the fact ? Had he become a great chess-player, or had he become a lover of the game, he never could have written the *Waverley* novels.

Milton and Pope rejected the game, for similar reasons. The author of *Paradise Lost* thought it was fit only for women, or weak men ; the author of the *Essay on Man* said, he would much rather play "nine-pins" than chess, for the former would afford him wholesome exercise, while the latter would injure the body as well

as the mind. Fond as Dean Swift was of fun, no one could induce him to occupy one hour of his time at chess.

And if we turn our attention to the great thinkers of other countries, we shall find that they were, if possible, still more opposed to the game. Gay and often reckless as Voltaire was, he shunned chess; it was a favourite saying of his, that it was an occupation suitable only for those who, having no ideas, could not keep themselves from sleeping even in the midst of lively company without playthings. Montaigne does not degrade the game quite so much as this, but he very unequivocally condemns it. We have remarked, in a preceding page, that some claim that chess is a noble pastime, because great kings and conquerors have been addicted to it. Montaigne shows that becoming intoxicated might be regarded as a noble pastime, on the same ground. "Why," says the philosopher, "should not I judge Alexander, roaring and drinking at the rate he sometimes used to do? Or, if he played at chess, what string of his soul was not touched by this *idle and childish game*? I hate and avoid it, because it is not play enough—that it is too grave and serious a diversion; and I am ashamed to lay out as much *thought and study upon that* as would serve to much better uses. He did not more pump his brains about his glorious expedition into the Indies; and another, that I will not name, took not more pains to unravel a passage upon which depends the safety of all mankind. To what a degree, then, does *this ridiculous diversion* molest the soul, when all her faculties shall be summoned together upon this trivial account? And how fair an opportunity she herein gives every one to know, and to make a right judgment of, himself? I do not more thoroughly sift myself in any other posture than this. What *passion* are we exempted from in this *insignificant game*? *Anger, spite, malice, impatience, and a vehement desire of getting the better in a matter wherein it were more excusable to be ambitious of being overcome*; for to be eminent and to excel above the common rate in frivolous things is nothing becoming in a man of quality and honour."*

There are many instances of promising young men having been diverted from an honourable career by chess-playing. Suffice it to mention Philador, who, before he

* Montaigne's Essays, vol. i., p. 439.

had devoted himself to the game of chess, had attained considerable celebrity as a composer; he destroyed his prospects in life by becoming addicted to chess-playing, as effectually as if he had addicted himself to intoxication.

If it be true, as we are told by the admirers of the game, that kings indulge in it, who can afford better to spend their time idly? Besides, all writers on the subject agree, that if the game was not discovered by a king, it was discovered for him, in order that he might learn from it how to gain victories; although it may well be doubted whether a real victory has ever been gained by means of chess-playing. Those curious enough to examine history for information on the subject, will find that they were the most stupid kings who had most confidence in chess—kings who were fit for nothing better than children's play. Gibbon gives us a striking illustration of this in his account of the conduct of the Greek Emperor Nicephorus towards the Caliph Al Rashid. The degenerate Greek fancying that he could frighten the caliph by reminding him that he was well skilled in the game of chess, writes to him as follows: "The queen (he meant Irene) considered me as a *rook* and herself as a *pawn*. That pusillanimous female submitted to pay a tribute, the double of which she ought to have exacted from the barbarians. Restore therefore the fruits of your injustice, or abide the determination of the sword." Having delivered this fine message, the ambassadors of the emperor cast a bundle of swords before the throne. The caliph smiled at the menace, and drawing his famous sword, *sansamah*, cut the Greek swords to pieces, and then dictated an epistle of characteristic brevity to the emperor, concluding with the following ominous words: "Thou shalt not hear, thou shalt behold my reply." *

It does not appear that the caliph knew any thing about chess, whereas Nicephorus had gained many a victory in the mimic field. But on the real field the state of facts was reversed. The chess-warrior brought ruin on himself by his foolish threat. "The progress of desolation by sea and land," says the historian, "from the Euxine to the Isle of Cyprus compelled the Emperor Nicephorus to retract his haughty defiance. In this new treaty, the ruins of Heraclea were left forever as a lesson and a

* Decline and Fall of Rom. Emp., vol. v., p. 309, Harpers' 12mo edit.

trophy, and the coin of the tribute was marked with the image and superscription of Harun and his three sons."*

Sometimes, too, kings and princes have become valiant over the chess-board, whose valour has not been noticed anywhere else. Thus we are told by Carte, the historian, that, before his accession to the throne of England, Henry I. engaged in a chess-match with Louis le Gros, son to Philip of France, at the court of the latter. Chess was played for money in 1087, as it is now, though, perhaps, not so often. At all events, Louis lost five or six games, and with them his temper; he threw the chess-men at Henry's head. Henry gave Louis a violent blow with the chess-board, in return, knocking him down; and the historian tells us that he would have killed him, had not Henry's brother Robert interposed.

Many similar instances might be given; and many players, of less illustrious rank than kings or princes, actually beat each others' brains out over the chess-board. Through the same influence, the most devoted friends have become irreconcilable enemies. Nor have the chess battles been always regarded as merely the efforts of individuals. Like the pugilists, the chess-players have had their national champions. We remember ourselves when Mr. Staunton was the champion of England, and, for aught we know, he still occupies the same proud position. The last international battle in which he was engaged, so far as we are informed, was that with M. St. Amant—the latter being the champion of France. The battles between the two champions have found several zealous historians, the majority of whom publish all the correspondence regulating the preliminaries. Mr. Bryan tells us, in a very curious pamphlet,† that in November, 1843, Mr. Staunton went over to Paris to play his first international match, accompanied by his two *seconds*, both enthusiastic amateurs. The first winner of eleven games was to be declared the conqueror. Mr. Staunton had scored ten when his adversary had won but two, and, under the same circumstances, might have been safely backed at any odds to secure one of the next two games, and consequently the match. But one of his seconds had to return to England. In his absence he became somewhat discouraged, and lost four games more before he gained the one which

* *Ib.*, vol. v., p. 310.

† *Historique de la Lutte entre l'Editeur du Palamède, Journal Français, et l'Editeur du Chess-Player's Chronicle, Journal Anglais.* Paris, chez C. Tresse.

decided the match. The English champion was, however, victorious, according to the conditions of the match, and France had to mourn another Waterloo. Every excuse was made by his countrymen for the defeated champion. He was out of practice, and not quite as well in health as usual, whereas the British champion had been training for months, and was in perfect condition. The evidence of all this, it was proclaimed, was overwhelming. "Des centaines de séances, des milliers de parties sont là pour l'attester." The English, upon the other hand, were not backward in celebrating the praises of their victorious champion; but before all was over there were more than one real fight which resulted from the mimic contest. One of the contestants had his nose mutilated; another had his eye permanently injured; and another complained to the police that he lost his purse in the *mêlée*, and was unable to return to England. These unpleasant results were attributed to certain incendiary articles which appeared in the *Palamède*, the French chess organ. We quote a specimen of one of these articles verbatim, for it would be spoiled by translation:—

"Rappelons alors à l'Angleterre que St. Amant ne se regarde pas comme battu; (!) qu'à son tour il se propose de demander une revanche; que St. Amant reçoit Pion et deux Traits de M. Des Chappelles. Rappelons lui, enfin, à cette orgueilleuse Albion, que les dieux de l'Olympe faisaient payer cher aux mortels la nécessité d'abandonner leurs célestes demeures!"

Of course, all men of sense on both sides of the Channel, who took any notice of the affair, only laughed at the foolishness of the international chess-men. In short, the affair created so much ridicule, that the most enthusiastic of the contestants got so much ashamed that they passed a resolution not to engage in any international matches in future. Whether they abstained accordingly or not we cannot say; but certain it is that we have never heard of any subsequent combat either mimic or real between the chess-players of France and England.

It might seem from these Anglo-Gallic matches, that it is the most enlightened countries that pay most attention to chess; but in general, the reverse of this is the fact. Any of our readers can easily ascertain for himself that in proportion as nations have become enlightened, on being acquainted with chess, have they discarded the game. In the middle ages it flourished in Italy, but the intellectual development to which the Medici family contributed

so much, soon brought chess into disrepute. It was not chess or any other species of gambling that occupied the thoughts of Dante, or Ariosto, Angelo, or Raphael.

It was not to instruct the Italians in the game of chess, that Leo X. invited the literary and scientific men of every country in Europe to Rome, and freely shared his comparatively slender income with all who were willing to aid him in the great work he had so much at heart; on the contrary, it was to give them a taste for nobler pursuits, and that it had this effect is well known. Previous to the time of Leo X., the Italians of all grades had occupied themselves with the game of chess since its importation from Turkey by the Crusaders; but the famous players of Italy now turned their attention to Spain, where the game soon became nearly as popular as bull-fighting.

But it is a great mistake to suppose that the Italians went on their gaming tours to Spain merely for the love of the game; their chief object was to make money. First, they gave instructions in chess-playing, and then played with their wealthy pupils for large sums. Considerable numbers had been ruined by this means, when the works of Cervantes, Calderon, De Vega, &c., turned the attention of the better classes to nobler objects; but then in a very few years the game fell into disuse, except among the lower orders, nor has it ever been revived since.

The game was introduced into England during the Heptarchy. Gale tells us that when Bishop Ætheric obtained admission to King Canute, about midnight, he found his majesty and his courtiers busily engaged at chess and dice.* The game became nearly as popular in England as it was in Italy and Spain; but its popularity finally yielded to the same influence, *i. e.*, in proportion as literature was cultivated the chess-board was set aside, or transferred to the servants of its former votaries.

Several of the kings of England have, indeed, been addicted to chess-playing. But which of them? Certainly not William the Conqueror, Edward III., or William III. Elizabeth thought it much more profitable, and more interesting withal, to read Sophocles or Æschylus in the original, than to play chess. Upon the other hand, King John (Lackland), who had neither intellect, nor knowledge, nor courage, was a famous chess-player. Charles I. played chess in his camp while within an hour's march

* Vide Gale's edition of Hist. Ramsiens, c. 86.

of Cromwell's army, and gained numerous victories on the chess-board. His majesty was deeply absorbed in a game of chess, in which he was likely to be the victor, when the messenger arrived with the news that the Scotch had sold him to his enemies for a specified sum, and that he was to be delivered up to Cromwell's army in a few days.

In short, not one of the great thinkers of England, or, indeed, of any other country, has been addicted to chess. Pitt, Fox, Burke, Sheridan, Addison, Grattan, and Peel, had each their faults; nearly all were occasionally intemperate, but none were so foolish as to devote the fine powers nature had given them to the mimic conflicts of the chess-board. Cowper, the poet, was assured by some friends, while subject to those fits of insanity that embittered the later years of his life, that he would derive much benefit from the game, if he would study it carefully. His reply is worthy of his genius. As it is also worthy the attention of all who have any doubt of the pernicious influence of chess-playing, we transcribe the following lines from his highly graphic and truthful description:—

“Who, then, that has a mind well strung and tuned
To contemplation, and within his reach
A scene so friendly to his favourite task,
Would *waste attention* at the chequered board,
His host of wooden warriors to and fro
Marching and countermarching, with an eye
As fixed as marble, with a forehead ridged
And furrowed into storms, and with a hand
Trembling, as if eternity were hung
In balance on his *conduct of a pin!*”

It will be admitted we have shown, in this brief and rapid sketch, that the greatest philosophers, historians, poets, satirists, and thinkers in general, ancient and modern, have been opposed to chess-playing. They have opposed the practice because they knew how much precious time it would consume, altogether independently of its pernicious influence in producing other vicious habits; and we are glad to add that they have not done so in vain.

In proof of this it would be almost sufficient to ask what nations pay most attention to chess at the present day? Is it the English, the French, or the Germans? Certainly not. It is the Turks and the Russians. This is no mere assertion; it is a fact with which every one who has travelled is familiar, and which all can ascertain

by very little research and inquiry. The lower orders of the Turks or Russians are not content to play discreetly in their tents, but in every large Turkish and Russian city groups of them eagerly pressing around the chess-board may be seen in almost every back street and dirty lane, often completely blocking up the passage, so that the police have to interfere. Many of the butchers, shoemakers, and hod-carriers who form these motley groups, whether at Constantinople or Moscow, understand the game much more thoroughly than those who practise at our reading-rooms, libraries, and even colleges.

Now, are the Turks and the Russians the two nations whose manners and customs, above all others, we should imitate? Does it become us to revive what Italians, Spanish, French, and English rejected many centuries ago as incompatible with the cultivation of the intellect and the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge? In every country the game will always be played to a greater or less extent by a certain class. There is no reason why it should not be played in this country as well as elsewhere by the idle and thoughtless. We would not write one line to prevent this, being quite aware that we might as well try to prove that no American citizen, native or naturalized, should ever again get intoxicated, swear, or chew tobacco, after a particular date.

What we protest against is the false and ridiculous pretension that the game of chess is aristocratic and classical, and consequently that it may be encouraged, if not directly taught even in our colleges. We are well aware that no college worthy of the name admits the chess-board as belonging to its curriculum; none do so that are of a higher grade than second or third rate boys' schools, which call themselves colleges, the same as it is the fashion at the present day for the most ignorant hod-carrier one meets to call himself a gentleman.

It is very safe to conclude that professors who encourage chess-playing, or any other species of gambling, which serves at best as an introduction to the bar-room, are not educated themselves, but that conscious of their ignorance and inability, they try to render themselves popular with the boys by pandering to their gambling propensities. We would not have such professors kicked and buffeted to death like the suitors of Penelope, nor would we have them tossed in a blanket like Sancho Panza, but we would certainly have their establishments shunned by all parents who set any value on the education of their sons.

- ART. IV. 1. *The Lectures of Sir William Hamilton.* London.
 2. *The Metaphysics of Aristotle.*
 3. *Essay on the Intellectual Faculties of Man.* REID.
 4. *Leçons sur la philosophie Kant.* COUSIN.
 5. *Essai sur l'origine des Connaissances Humaines.* CONDILLAC.

EVERY one asks, what is pure reason? Most men put the question as Pilate asked of Jesus, "What is truth?" and turn away, not pausing for an answer. Of those who inquire earnestly, and with a sincere desire to receive a true answer, very few obtain what they desire. It is easy for one who is affluent of words, and gifted with a fruitful and discursive imagination, to essay an answer to this or any other conceivable question; to veil undefined ideas under the showy folds of gorgeous imagery, to dazzle the fancy with brilliant generalities, or confound the judgment under a mass of inconsequent aphorisms. To such intellectual pyrotechnics, flashing upon us, like mimic sunlight, from the illuminati of our American Orient, we are all accustomed; yet many, it must be confessed, would prefer to all this the pure radiance of simple truth. When the writer was a lad, he was one evening holding a light for a man who was performing a piece of difficult work. Finding that the light was not held in a proper position, the workman said:—"Hold the light so that *you* can see my work, and then *I* shall be able to see it." With a similar idea in mind, the present purpose of the writer is, to define pure reason, as it appears to his own mental perception; and enable the reader to view the subject in the same light with himself, and from the same stand-point. If the reader shall think that the argument wants lucidness, it is hoped that he will not deny to it the merit of compactness, as well as brevity; and if he shall be inclined to complain that the style of the discussion is wanting in grace and vivacity, the only apology is, that a severe simplicity of style is most appropriate to discussions of this character.

Whoever attentively studies the operations of the human mind, especially while it is employed in attempts to solve the recondite problems of the higher philosophies, will not fail to encounter the often mooted question, whether the mind is really endowed with such a faculty as that called pure reason, whereby the quality of truth may be determined perceptively, and independently

of the reasoning process termed ratiocination. This question is only to be properly determined by considering maturely the nature of the mental faculties, their capabilities, and in what manner their operations are performed, and from these premises deducing the principles and laws in conformity with which their functions are exercised.

The task before us will be rendered comparatively easy, if we first consider that there is an analogy between the perceptive faculties and those which are called conceptive, and that what is commonly termed conception is only another name for perception, though of another kind from that which is peculiar to our organs of sense; that, while we have organs by which we perceive the existence and qualities of those external objects which are material, we have, also, faculties by which we perceive the existence and qualities of entities that are immaterial, yet equally actual with those that are palpable to our physical senses. That we have spiritual faculties of simple perception, will appear probable to all. We are conscious that our minds take cognizance not only of thought and affection in the abstract, but of particular thoughts and affections; and although we know them to be only immaterial entities, we never doubt the reality of their existence, any more than we doubt the existence of material objects.

Carrying this analogy one grade further, we are aware that for every external physical sense there are in the world of matter corresponding entities, and it follows, if the analogy holds good, that for every spiritual sense there are corresponding immaterial entities. The deduction to be drawn from this statement will be perceived to be of the utmost consequence, when we consider what are the faculties of the human mind and the subjects of which they are capable of taking cognizance. We know that thoughts, affections, moral qualities, and ideas, are entities, and we know this only by a direct mental perception, entirely distinct from that we have of material entities and their qualities; and that it is just as impossible for us to perceive the former by means of sight, hearing, or feeling, as it is for our moral perceptions to discover to us material objects and their properties. It is, therefore, by our internal consciousness that we discover the actual existence and different functions of these two kinds of perception. There is, common to our faculties of perception, by which we take cognizance of things material and of those that are immaterial, an instinct of activity, by which they seek for objects upon which to

act. Where this instinct manifests itself with extraordinary energy, if the faculty is one of the class which we designate as knowing faculties, we call it curiosity, or thirst for knowledge: or, if it be of the class of affectional faculties, we call it sensibility, or feeling, and by so doing recognize its analogy to the faculties of the physical senses.

In addition to the power of perception, all these faculties of the mind have a function of rumination, by which, dwelling upon and digesting ideas in the mind, as substances are macerated and digested in the alembic of the chemist, from the bringing together of several ideas a new and composite idea is produced, somewhat analogous to the *tertium quid* of the chemists. This function of the mental faculties is called reflection.

One faculty of the mind perceives causes and effects, or the relation of causation: this is, pre-eminently, the reasoning faculty. It is well to consider carefully the nature of this faculty, for on it, and its functional office, the whole argument hinges. Causation has been loosely defined as an order of sequence. To determine the fallacy in this definition it is only necessary to consider a single cause and its sequences; and if any of these sequences have direct and positive relation to this cause and other sequences have not, but are dependent on other causes, wholly or in part, then the consequences of an action are not always necessarily caused by it. Undoubtedly, effects are sequents of causes. A man may plunge his hand into a heated liquid, and it shall be burned; again, a man may perform the same act, but no burning of the hand results. In the first case, it would commonly be said the burning was the effect of thrusting the hand into the heated mass; but the second sequence proves that the alleged cause was inadequate to the effect, but that the burning was the result of the action of the hot mass upon the flesh of the hand, which, in the second instance, was prevented by covering the hand with a substance which hindered the caloric of the fluid from acting on the hand. Here we see that the cause of an effect must have a certain positive relation to it, in the very nature of things, and that without this relation a sequence may be entirely fortuitous. If we see a fox cross the road, and presently a hound follows in the same direction, we say that the fox runs because the dog is pursuing him; but if a hound crosses the road, and presently a fox follows, we instantly perceive that the sequence is fortuitous, and that, in the

nature of things, the relation of causation is wanting. Wherefore we conclude that sequence, or order of sequence, is an imperfect and inexact definition of causation; and that, while an effect is always, philosophically, sequent of its cause, there is besides sequence a relation, in the nature of things, between them, such as we recognize between an actor and his act, and not merely such as exists between an act and its possible consequences. If it be said, "God said 'let light be,' and light was," an unreasoning intelligence will perceive that one event succeeded the other, and nothing more; the reasoning faculty alone can perceive the relation of the fiat to the fact, and that the one was the cause of the other. The idea of this relation is, then, essential to the idea of causes and effects as such, and we must therefore conclude that a consciousness of both the nature and relation of cause and effect constitutes the simple and perceptive function of this faculty, as distinct from its ruminant or reflective function. *This perceptive function, independently of ratiocination, by syllogistic or mathematical methods, constitutes, so far as this faculty, considered by itself, is concerned, the element of pure reason.* Unreasoning brutes perceive sequences and bear them in remembrance, as, for example, that when they hear a certain call and go to their cribs they find food there, or if they do certain acts the whip of the master scourges them; but of the relation of causation existing in the nature of things, they have no conception; this last being the prerogative of man.

To more clearly define the nature and function of the faculty of reason, it becomes desirable to regard it in its relation to the other faculties of the mind. Reason is not an affection, such as love or hate, nor does it take direct or perceptive cognizance of the moral quality of actions, yet its relation to the other faculties is intimate and consequential. Conscience, as we universally agree, alone takes cognizance of moral quality. In the instance of any human act, tried in the court of conscience, the perceptions testify to the facts, reason determines the relation of cause and effect between the intention of the agent and the consequences of his act, and then the moral sense is competent to rightly determine the moral quality of the action. All decisions of conscience concerning the moral quality of actions, that are unsupported by reason, are unadvised and liable to be erroneous. The functions of moral sense and reason are, however, as distinct as those

of the eye and the ear. Again, there is in the mind a religious faculty, the faculty of adoration. This faculty, equally with the moral sense, is distinct from reason; yet, like the moral sense, it is dependent upon reason for the right direction of its exercise. Left to itself, it gropes blindly towards the divine, discerning, indeed, its quality, but uncertain of its fact, and, often seizing upon objects unworthy of its highest exercise, pays to them the homage due to God alone. We shall see how reason aids the religious faculty.

Reason, instinctively casting its regards abroad throughout creation, finds it filled with effects; discovers, indeed, that all things are effects. Searching to find the causes of these effects, it finds innumerable causes for parts of them, and finds, also, that these causes are themselves effects. Following these chains of effects, proper and causative effects, to their ultimate, it arrives at the conclusion that all things are effects, and that the cause of these effects must be infinite, and therefore one. Reason of itself cannot regard the Deity in any other sense than that of an infinite cause, the ultimate of all actual and possible causes. This result pure reason arrives at, not by process of ratiocination, but instinctively and perceptively. The reasoning man, who attempts to bring the reason of other men to the same conclusion, is, however, compelled to perform this fact by a process of ratiocination.

This we must conceive to be the true theory of pure reason, stripped of the drapery of mysticism in which pedants have enshrouded it. It lifts alike the soul of the peasant and the philosopher, the shepherd and the prelate, up to the knowledge of the very God, and points the adoring faculty to the true and only worthy object of its worship. From this summit of wisdom, the just ideas of the economy of divine providence, and of the moral laws of the universe, flow downwards in streams of synthesis, to inform, refresh, and invigorate the souls of men. The moral, rational, and religious faculties, which not only distinguish man from the brute creation, but constitute for him an entity as a moral being, distinct from his animal nature, are the eyes and ears of his understanding, by means of which he receives inspirations and spiritual suggestions, and through which he offers worship and supplication and derives consolations, and becomes likewise participant of the divine love and wisdom.

Here we have a solution of the mystery of the Divine

in the human. The human is receptive of the divine, when the superior faculties of the former are open to its access, as naturally as a flower is supplied with the dew and rain of heaven when it opens its thirsty calyx to receive them.

The mind of man, elevated by pure reason to a knowledge of the Divine, afterwards deduces divine laws and truths from this fountain-head by syllogistic ratiocination. Tracing down, link by link, the chain of reason, he finds that it extends to the minutest, and even through the minutest objects of creation, to the most stupendous and sublime, and at every step of his explorations, if the faculties of his soul are developed harmoniously, he will find his conceptions of the infinite wisdom constantly enlarging, and his soul more and more filled with awe and the spirit of worship; and this sense of the infinite majesty would overwhelm his weak faculties, if he did not, at the same time, bear in mind the truth that the Divine love and condescension are likewise infinite.

In proportion as man comes into the divine, in the same degree he becomes possessed of the divine ideas; and, to this extent, when he contemplates the creation, he sees it, as it were, with the eyes of God. Thus seeing, he perceives that the Supreme Being regards all his creatures with an equal and infinite love, and man thus learns how it may be possible for himself to become so imbued with the divine spirit, that he shall actually obey the sublime law of love, by, at the same time, loving God with all his soul and his neighbor as himself; which is the perfect fulfilment of that law which Christ declared to be the sum of the divine law.

The foregoing discussion brings into view an important element of the theory of pure reason, namely, the mutual dependence between reason and the other faculties for the exercise of even their perceptive function. We have seen that the moral sense cannot take cognizance of the moral quality of an action, until reason has determined the relation of causation between the intent and the consequence of the act; and, likewise, that the religious faculty seeks blindly and ineffectually towards the divine, until reason finds for it, and discovers to it, the ultimate cause, which, when it perceives, the religious faculty itself discovers to be divine, reason having no proper perception of the divine, as such, but only as a cause. But the function of reason does not stop at the point where it has discovered to the religious faculty the first cause; it has

yet to discover to the moral faculty the characteristics of this self-existent causative entity. To do this, it is necessary for reason to learn from religion the nature of divine quality, and from conscience the nature of moral quality; and of these qualities it must first be informed before it can discuss the laws of religious and moral relation between God and the moral universe, in the same manner in which it must be informed by the faculties appropriate to the physical senses, respecting the nature and qualities of matter, before it can discuss the laws of matter, and the theory of the material universe. Pure reason has received a broader definition than the one we have above given, and has been asserted to be a faculty of the mind, by which it perceives the very truth of things, independent of any process of ratiocination; in other words, it has not been by this latter definition confined to the perceptive function of the rational faculty, but extended equally to the perceptive function of all the faculties of the human mind.

Whether the specific name, pure reason, shall have attached to it the broad and general signification of embracing the perceptive function of all the faculties of the mind, or whether it shall be held to apply only to the perceptive function of the rational faculty, is a question of minor importance, compared to the ascertainment of the direct and relative functions of the faculties of the mind; for this understanding furnishes us with the materials needful for the construction of the true theory of the mind, which must be the corner-stone of mental philosophy; and for want of which many learned and ingenious thinkers have failed in their noble endeavours towards placing the science of mental philosophy on a firm and enduring foundation. It would seem to be most accordant to the idea of philosophical accuracy to confine the term within the narrower limits to which the name itself is alone appropriate. The propriety of this restriction is the more apparent when we reflect that to the exercise of the perceptive function of the faculty of reason we are indebted for the discriminations which the mind instinctively makes between the true and the false, the seeming and the real, in an immense multiplicity of instances. The mind which is deficient in this faculty is constantly exposed to the danger of mistaking sequents for effects, and finds it difficult, even when warned of its error, to discriminate between the two; and hence arise, rather than from wilful perversion, an immense

proportion of the errors and mistakes which constantly disturb the order of society and imperil its welfare. A broad illustration will make this point clear to the most casual observation. A ship goes to sea on Friday, and is lost. The unreasoning mind of the ignorant sailor never goes farther in accounting for this calamity than to the fact that the vessel sailed on an unlucky day; while reason, discerning that between the two facts no possible relation of causation exists, goes farther in its search for the true occasion of the disaster, and finds, either in the insecurity of the vessel, in its improper management, or in some unforeseen casualty, its certain cause.

The question may arise, Does not the reasoning faculty necessarily carry on a syllogistic process for the purpose of determining that all things in creation are effects, and, likewise, in ascertaining the true cause of these effects? The answer is, not necessarily; for it is to be borne in mind that this faculty alone is capable of discerning effects as such and their relation to causes. While among a multiplicity of causes and effects, a rational process, similar to the mathematical one called *reductio ad absurdum*, may be necessary, in order to determine to which particular cause a certain effect is related, no such difficulty arises in considering creation as a unit, for the faculty of reason instinctively, and *proprio vigore*, discerns whether this entity is an effect or a cause, and having found the effect to be infinite, in extensity, decides that its cause is infinite, and therefore one; which is the sum of our proposition. In this statement of the argument, we have not gone beyond the axioms of mathematics or of logic, and the argument is therefore complete, without ratiocination.

Referring to the foregoing remark, that "the effect" (creation) "is infinite in extensity," it may be proper to more clearly define in what manner the term infinite can be applied to the creation. If it could with truth be affirmed that matter is absolutely infinite, it would follow of necessity that matter could not be an effect, for nothing is beyond infinity, and every effect must have a cause equal to itself; and to say that an effect is infinite, and its cause is also infinite, thereby affirming the existence of two infinities, would be to utter a solecism, which reason abhors. It is necessary, therefore, if the term infinite is applied to an effect, such as creation, that it should be understood only in the qualified sense that the creative cause is infinite *in esse*, while the creation itself

is only infinite *in posse*. The mathematical line called the asymptote is an illustration of infinitive approximation, as distinct from absolute infinity.

The experiments of Professor Plateau, for determining the "figures of equilibrium in a liquid mass withdrawn from the action of gravity," have demonstrated that, in all such figures, excepting the sphere, while their minor axes, or "axes of revolution," are finite, their major axes, or axes of extensity, are "infinite;" that is to say, the figures are capable of infinite extension in one direction, without ever arriving at ultimate and determinate forms, while in the other direction their forms and dimensions are definite. While this ingenious savant disavows all idea that these phenomena, being regulated by the law of molecular attraction, can be regarded as indicative of the laws of equilibrium governing the forms and motions of cosmical bodies, which are subject to the influence of inter-planetary attraction, his statement of the result of his experiments affords a most apt analogy to the idea which reason entertains respecting the created universe; namely, that while it is finite as to the actual dimensions of its particulars, it is infinite in its possible extensity; and, as all things are possible only to what is absolutely infinite, therefore the cause of what is infinite *in posse* must be infinite *in esse*.

If it should be objected that this statement is obnoxious to the liability of involving the solecism of two infinities, the sufficient answer is, that creation, the effect, is but an emanation or product of the cause, which includes within its own infinity all its possible infinite effects, of which the infinite cause is the sum and essence. As, then, all effects, which are all things, are within the infinite, and as pure reason, only, is competent to sweep around the sublime circuit of the universe, and to perceive the infinite, it is the faculty by which the knowledge of all truths is possible to the human mind.

The argument is now complete, as to its main purpose. It remains to consider whether the faculty of reason does not perceptively take cognizance of relation, in general, and of all relations in particular. Each faculty, for itself, takes cognizance of its own relation to that of which it is perceptive: the hearing faculty of its relation to sound, the affections to their objects, adoration to the divine, and the moral sense of its relation to moral actions; but reason has in this regard a wider scope. It is the special function of reason to deal with all questions

of relation, and it must, therefore, be assumed that it perceptively takes cognizance of relation in general, as it does of the relation of causation in particular; but of other relations in particular, it does not necessarily take perceptive cognizance, but deals with them by means of the reasoning process, which is distinct from the perceptive function of the reasoning faculty, and constitutes its ruminative or reflective function.

The mind is enabled by process of reasoning to determine what is true, and to distinguish it from what is false, by demonstrating the fallacy and absurdity of all other conclusions than the true ones.

The proposition that the whole is equal to all its parts is no more self-evident than is the one that two sides of a triangle A, B, C, being given, the third side is A, C; and the proposition—two sides of a triangle and the contained angle being given, to find the third side involves no process of reasoning any more than the two axiomatic ones just given; for the mind instantly perceives that the third side can only be A, C, and that its dimension is simply a matter of mensuration or calculation, involving no process of reasoning whatever. The same is true of a syllogism. That the major and minor involve the conclusion is instantly perceived to be a truism; as, for example, if it be stated that all biped animals, having wings and feathers, are birds; that a turkey is a winged and feathered biped animal, therefore a turkey is a bird; is only equivalent to saying that a bird is a bird. Calling it a turkey, or an owl, makes no difference with the fact of the proposition. The faculty of reason, in all such cases, does not elaborate, it simply perceives. But if the question should be propounded, *aliunde*,—is the bat a bird, or does it belong to some other genus? Numerous questions of fact arise concerning the structure, functions, and habits of this animal, as compared with those of the several animal species to which it may be supposed to be related; questions of adaptation, conformity, &c., in the discussion and resolution of which the reasoning faculty takes part, in common with the observing and knowing faculties. The office of reason, in this and in similar discussions is, to determine the laws of adaptation and relation concerned therein; and the entire proceeding is commonly understood and defined as being a process of reasoning, although other faculties besides that of reason partake therein: and this designation is correct, because the process would be wholly in-

consequent, without the participation of the reasoning faculty.

Every faculty of the mind has a ruminative function. Impressions made upon the mental perceptions after a time lose their vividness, and are said to be forgotten or displaced by more recent impressions; but often, and especially when the faculties are not employed perceptively, they revive ideas before impressed upon them, and re-peruse the tablets of memory. The mind resembles a palimpsest from which whatever has been written upon it is never so entirely erased that it may not again become legible, notwithstanding what has subsequently been inscribed on the same surface; and it is believed that no impression once made upon the mind is ever wholly lost, but that the dimmest of former thoughts may be reproduced in their original clearness and vividness. Certain it is, that each faculty, by itself, and especially when stimulated thereto by the sympathetic action of its associate faculties, is capable of recalling an almost endless succession of former thoughts and sensations long forgotten, as well as those that are more recent. This is peculiarly noticeable in dreams, in the day-dreams of the senile, and especially in somnambulism. The reasoning faculty, recalling numerous perceptions of causes and relations, and ruminating upon them, using them as the weaver does the warp and woof of his loom, combines them into new associations, whereby relations before unnoticed are perceived to exist, and new ideas are formed, which we denominate original ideas, as being distinct from those produced by the act of perception. This mental process is properly designated as conception, a term improperly applied to ideas resulting from mere perception. Conception, therefore, is the act of forming original ideas within the mind.

It is further to be remarked concerning rumination, that if one faculty is thus employed, the neighbouring or related faculties do not remain dormant, but are awakened to a similar exercise, the result of which is called the association of ideas. The associate action of the other faculties, in concert with the faculty of reason, induces ratiocination, while those faculties are reviving former impressions, equally as while they are receiving eternal impressions; and this condition of the mind is more favourable to reflection and conception, as the mutual harmony of action is less liable to disturbance than when the faculties are awake to the intrinsic entrance to exter-

nal impressions foreign to the subjects which the mind has under consideration. The mind, in this condition, is like a council deliberating with closed doors, instead of holding its sessions in a public thoroughfare.

The conceptive or reflective mood of the mind is the one most favourable to the discovery of the laws of the material world, as well as of the moral universe. The explorer and the experimentist are usually so absorbed in their special pursuits that they are, as a general rule, little inclined to generalization. A division of labour seems to be attended with results as salutary in intellectual affairs as in those of a mechanical character. Every man labours most efficiently in that pursuit for which he has a natural predilection. While many take delight in the collection of facts, others prefer to erect these facts into systems, and still others to determine their theories. It is the same as in the building of a temple; many procure materials, others fit them to their appropriate places in the building, and one architect plans and superintends the building of the edifice. The discovery and collection of facts which are essential to the formation of systems and theories, is a labour the zealous and industrious prosecution of which is worthy of all commendation, but the right employment of these facts is the chief glory of an age of intellectual progress.

The men who have conferred the most valuable and lasting benefits upon the world have been its thinkers—its thinkers, not its dreamers. Sir Isaac Newton attributed his successes in the discovery of the laws of matter and of motion to his habit of continuous and protracted thought upon whatever subject interested him, rather than to superior mental acumen. It was by reflection that Dr. Franklin conceived the idea of the identity of electricity and lightning, as well as the method by which he tested the truth of his conception; and by the same process Professor Morse conceived the idea of his electro-magnetic telegraph. The cotton-gin was conceived in the mind of Whitney before his hands essayed the first rude model of his machine. The frescoes of Michael Angelo were painted in his fancy before his hand seized the pencil or the brush; and the Cathedral of St. Peter's stood sublime in the mind of the architect before the first stone of his work was laid in its place. By the reflective exercise of the reasoning faculty, the statesman is able to forecast the future bearings of laws and institutions upon the welfare of millions of the human family; and the

moral philosopher, by the same process, deduces the laws of human conduct, points out to erring man the paths of rectitude and the remedies for the moral evils that afflict society; and, piercing even into the deep things of the divine, learns whatever it is possible for man to know concerning the theories of Divine Providence and moral government, and reverently complies with the divine injunction to acquaint himself with the mind of God himself.

If one were to propound the question, What is truth? to a dozen different individuals, he would from each of them receive a different answer. One might be: "Truth is the thought of God;"—a safe answer, yet by no means a definitive one, for the thought of God is truth, and more. Another would probably be: "Truth is the reality of things,"—a tautological answer; for if truth is reality, why not call it reality? But language is not nearly so rich in synonyms as many people, and even many lexicographers, suppose. Reality is not abstract, while truth is; and truth, therefore, is not reality.

Reason, the legislator of the mind, defines truth to be—the *idea of the reality of things*. If you correctly and perfectly describe to another person any particular thing, you tell him the truth concerning it, for you convey into his mind the *idea* of the thing as it really is, or the idea of its reality; certainly not its actual reality. To realize any thing, is to have the thing itself in possession; and to realize the truth concerning any thing, is to have the idea of the reality of the thing in the mind.

According to the rational theory, the *sin* of lying and the *evil* of lying are two distinct things; and, excepting that the sin of lying originates in evil, one of the two may exist without the other. The sin of lying consists in the bad intent in which the lie is conceived, while the evil of lying is in its consequences. Of the moral quality of the intent, the moral sense takes direct cognizance; but of the moral quality of the act, the moral sense only takes cognizance when reason has determined the relation of causation between the act and its consequences; and if these are evil, the act, as well as the intent, is evil. If a person utters truth, believing it to be falsehood, and with malevolent intent, the sinfulness is confined to the intent. A falsehood may be uttered without malevolent intent, the utterer even supposing it to be truth, yet its consequences may be as evil as if its utterance had originated in express malice. In this instance the evil is

complete, the act is bad, and yet the intent to falsify is absent; still, the judgment of reason is, that, as it is the duty of every man to consider well the consequences as well as the motives of his actions, and likewise to be assured of the truthfulness of his utterances, he who does not practise caution in these respects is amenable to moral censure. Truth may be uttered with the intention to work an evil consequence, and in this example the sin is equal to that of lying, for the intent is equally evil in its origin, and the act in its consequences. A man may tell what is true, believing it to be false, and, no evil consequences ensuing from the act, may flatter himself that he is excused, yet the sin of lying is on his conscience; and a man may intentionally utter a falsehood from the best and most benevolent motive; as if he were to tell a flagrant assassin that the victim of whom he is in pursuit had passed around the street-corner, when he had really fled through a doorway. Here is no sinful intent and no evil consequence, and yet the utterance is a technical lie.

It will be at once perceived that the rule which reason dictates with regard to lying, is the same which applies to every question of moral turpitude; namely, that the sin is in the intent, and the evil is in the consequences of the act. Our criminal laws do not intend to measure their penalties according to the moral guilt of criminal actions; for those laws, being established only for the protection of society, have regard mainly to the evil consequences of those actions upon the rights and happiness of society and its members; and they wisely leave the punishment of moral turpitude to the adjudication of Him who sees the hearts of men and their intents; excepting from the above rule, those cases where the accused, being shown to have been guiltless of evil intention, is acquitted of crime. These rules of criminal law correspond with the dictates of reason; for reason determines that, wherever, from the nature of things and circumstances, the truth is involved in uncertainty, as in the case of determining degrees of moral guilt and its punishment, inaction is the only safe policy for finite man to pursue; but it equally dictates that wherever truth, clearly revealed, beckons her votaries, she is a moral coward who hesitates to obey her supreme behests.

From the foregoing discussion it is apparent, that reason is the one faculty which distinguishes between the apparent and the real, between truth and the deceptive

illusions that assume its semblance ; which puts the coin-stamp upon the materials of knowledge, and gives them all their value ; and, in fine, that by so much as wisdom is superior to mere knowledge, by so much is reason superior to those knowing faculties which man possesses in common with the brute creation.

One chief object kept continually in view in this brief exposition of the Rational Theory, is the vindication of that theory from the imputation, often cast upon it, that it tends to dampen the ardour of religious fervor, to weaken the sense of moral obligation, and to unsettle belief in the received doctrines of religious faith. To the plausibility of these charges, the partial views promulgated by pretended rationalists have too often given a seeming confirmation ; but whoever has perused this discussion of the subject with careful attention and in a spirit of candour, will acknowledge that it tends to show that reason is the true friend and efficient ally of religion and virtue, and that only by perversion can it be viewed as inculcating aught that is inimical to either ; and, even more, that in its general scope it does not intermeddle with disputed questions of morals or of theological belief, but favours that charity which tolerates and makes allowance for differences of opinion, while it stimulates the development of all that is elevating, ennobling, and devotional, in human thought and affection.

Nothing is more common than for controvertists to attempt to gain advantages over their adversaries by applying to them odious epithets, such as "materialist," "spiritualist," or those grosser terms in which our vernacular abounds ; as in former times the learned were accused of magic, witchcraft, and Satanic arts, compacts, and instigations. This kind of ordeal the votary of truth may not hope to escape, neither is it lawful for him to fabricate for himself defensive weapons against these assaults. Truth is strongest when armed only with herself, and borrows no weapons of offence or defence ; but, naked and alone goes forth to the work of conquest. Her defenders, even her most valiant heroes and martyrs, may perish, yet should they not despair at their mishaps and defeats, but remember, that though they fall, their cause shall not want ample vindication, and that truth shall certainly win and wear the immortal bays of victory.

There are numerous mathematical propositions of whose conclusions reason does not take instant cognizance ; as, for example, the familiar proposition that the

square of the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the square of both its sides. In the discussion of this problem, the knowing and calculating faculties present the successive elements of the figures, and instantly, as each is produced, the reason perceives their relative values, and by their association in combination determines the truth of the conclusion. The same is true of theories involving the correlation of forces, whether natural or mechanical, whose laws reason can only determine by the aid of other faculties.

In all the foregoing examples, as well as in numerous others, the reason does not act until some elements of relation, either of causation, adaptation, or proportion, are presented to its view; and whenever that is done, reason instantly perceives each relation, and its law; and whenever the complement of individual relations and their laws is made up, reason perceives their mutual relation of adaptation, and determines their theory. Defects and errors in rational theories are due less to the imperfection of the rational process than to the imperfect presentment of facts by the knowing faculties. As, in logic, the major and minor must both exist, and must both be true, or the conclusion is uncertain, so all the elements of a rational theory must be present and certain, or the theory will be defective; and if any of the elements are false, the theory is erroneous. It is common to attribute errors in rational theories to the defectiveness of reason, yet nothing can be farther from the truth, for reason, being normal, is as infallible as normal eyesight. Werner, spent his whole life in a champaign country, the superposition of whose rocks was uniform and undisturbed, inferred from this uniformity his Neptunian theory, according to which all rocks have been formed by sedimentary deposition; but his pupil, Von Buch, extending his travels into volcanic regions and countries abounding in hills and mountains, was impelled to adopt the theory of upheaval by igneous agency, and his reason compelled him to abandon the errors of the Neptunian theory, and adopt the truths of the Plutonian theory. In this instance, it is apparent that the defectiveness of the Neptunian system theory arose from the imperfectness of the facts from which it was inferred, while the superior truthfulness of the Plutonian theory resulted from the broader basis of facts upon which it was founded.

Ratiocination is involved in demonstrating the truth of a postulate or proposition apagogically, or by the

mathematical process called *reductio ad absurdum*, by assuming the converse to be true, and demonstrating the fallacy or absurdity of its logical or mathematical conclusion. This method of reasoning is the most common of any in practical use, and is often resorted to for the purpose of determining by proof the truth of theories which, in consequence of the imperfection of human faculties, had before rested in some degree of uncertainty. In this, as in all ratiocination, the laws of relation, or ratio, form the constituent in the conclusion which is due to the action of the faculty of reason. Even as to the transcendental truth of the being and attribute of the self-existent Infinite, the revelation of the perceptive function of reason is fortified, and the understanding is confirmed in its acceptance of the truth, by apagogical assumptions of the contrary and their fallacious conclusions.

Tried by all tests, the adamantine integrity of the sublime central truth of the divine Infinity becomes more and more obvious to human understanding, and the mind—which at first received the intuitive perception of pure reason with trembling and fearful joy, a joy qualified by a shade of doubt, deepened by a consciousness of the importance of the subject—at length is brought to rest in a perfect and unquestioning confidence, fast anchored to what it can no longer doubt will remain unmoved, though all things else should tremble to their fall. The solid rocks, through whose cleft summits up-lifted to the skies volcanic fires blaze forth in awful splendor, descending, sink below the surface of the earth, and form the immovable basis on which rest and from which are produced both soil, and all the varied forms of vegetable and animal organization, with which the earth is covered; and, likewise, the sublime truth of the infinite divine, constitutes the grand fundamental basis from which all true systems of divine, moral, and social philosophy originate, and on which alone any theory concerning them can securely rest.

The *unity* of the Divine is a truth of which the human mind with difficulty arrives at a perfect comprehension, although reason determines it as necessary to infinitude. Man is several in faculties, as in numbers, and in contemplating the Supreme Being, thinks of him as several, and speaks understandingly of the divine power, wisdom, and goodness, as he would of those attributes in a superior man, as well as of subdivisions of these imputed attributes, such as love, hatred, benevolence, justice,

truth, &c., equal in number, and, as he imagines similar in function to the moral, intellectual, and affectional faculties of man; nor do many good men deem that they well understand the Supreme Being in his relation to his creatures, until they have satisfactorily imagined to themselves in what manner each one of all these attributes is exercised. It might be a thankless and unprofitable task to attempt to uproot these deeply-seated ideas from many devout minds, but those who desire to know all truths that may be known will find their attempts to conceive of the divine unity aided by reflecting that in every divine action, whether of creation, sustentation, or administration, power, wisdom, and goodness are equally manifested, as being employed consentaneously and in perfect harmony; and by considering how utterly impossible it is to imagine, in this view, that either of these supreme attributes, supposing them to be infinite and equal, could permit an act to be done in which each should not have an equal share; or, to state the idea in other words and more broadly, how an infinitely good being could do a bad action, or an infinitely wise being could do an unwise action, or how an infinitely powerful being could be susceptible of weakness; and hence, as these attributes are manifestly equal and infinite, and there can be no plurality of infinity—they are necessarily one.

What, then, of evil? some will ask. The answer is plain. Good, the synonym of God, alone, is infinite; evil is finite, an effect and instrument of good. Within the embracement of infinity, evil has its birth and death, its origin and its end. Nothing, in the moral any more than in the physical universe, can exist which is not an effect of the infinite cause. If this answer fails to satisfy any one who believes that God is infinite, he will profit by the attempt to frame any other rational answer to his inquiry. We learn to become reconciled to this truth, when, by experience and observation, we come to understand and believe that they love most to whom most is forgiven, that sorrows and afflictions chasten the affections, subdue the passions and discipline the soul, giving it the supremacy over the impulses of the animal nature, and thus enabling it by freer exercise to develop its strength and enlarge its capacities for the enjoyment of celestial beatitude; and that even Death, the very king of terrors, opens the portals of immortal life.

Every truth is in harmony with every other truth;

but especially is this to be affirmed of the one truth of the infinite unity, the grand key-note, to which all other truths respond "in perfect diapason," each contributing to swell the volume of the sublime symphony of universal harmony.

ART. V.—1. *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages.*
By HENRY HALLAM.

2. *Legende der Heiligen, (Chronicles of the Saints), Art. St. Thomas, von F. X. WENINGER.*

3. *Œuvres complètes de A. F. OZANAM.* 8 tomes. 8vo. Paris, 1853.

4. *Opera D. Thomæ, 17 vols., fol. Romæ, 1570.*

THE history of the Middle Ages in its bearing on literature and civilization has lately been engaging the earnest attention of some of the best cultivated and untrammelled intellects, and their researches have earned for them fame and honour. In English literature, Hallam, Maitland, and a writer in Blackwood's Magazine have particularly distinguished themselves in this field; but to German writers is perhaps due the credit of having taken the lead in the enterprise; and foremost among these stand Hurtur,* Voigt, and others of minor reputation. Still the palm of success in mediæval researches, must unquestionably be awarded to a French writer, the late lamented M. Ozanam, whose premature decease in 1853, at the age of about forty years, has deprived literature of one of its best exemplars, and society of one of its brightest ornaments.

There are some writers who see nothing great or worthy of commendation but in the remote ages of antiquity,—Christian or Pagan as their predilection may be,—while there are others who take opposite views, and can see nothing deserving of praise or admiration, but in recent or modern times; and both parties have to a great extent ignored the Middle Ages, as if these ages were devoid of all interest. For our own part we belong to neither school exclusively. We see much to admire, as well as to condemn, in remote antiquity, as well as in the Middle Ages; and we are sorry that we have to say the same in regard to our own times. But let us not be misunder-

* *Histoire du Pape Innocent III. et de ses Contemporains, traduite de l'Allemand.*

stood : upon the whole we are well pleased and thankful that our own lot has been cast in the 19th century "with all its faults," yet, this shall not deter us from giving due praise—

"wherever found,
Whether on Heathen or on Christian ground."

The whole period of the Middle Ages extending from the eighth to the thirteenth century, has been by some sciolists called the "dark ages," but if there were any solid foundation for this name, it ought in all fairness and candour to be limited to the first two or three centuries of that period. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries assuredly produced men, and women too, that for their genius and erudition would have merited halos of glory in any age or nation whatever. The names of St. Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, Vincent de Beauvais; and of Roger Bacon (sometimes known under the name of Friar Bacon), Alexander of Hales, John Duns Scotis and St. Bonaventure will ever continue to illustrate with an enviable effulgence, the latter centuries of the middle ages.

We design in this article to speak more particularly of St. Thomas and of his writings, and in introducing him to our readers we feel confident that whatever they may think of his religion, they will be much pleased with the man himself, with his moral beauty, his unassuming manners, his amiable disposition, but above all with his gigantic intellect, his penetrating genius, and his vast literary labours. And as they will naturally desire to know something of the history of such a man, we will, before noticing his writings, present them an outline of his life. It may be proper to premise that in the books he has received several names, as Thomas Aquino, Thomas of Aquin, Thomas of Acquin, &c.,* but the name we have given him appears to us the most correct one, and the one by which he is more generally known.

If nobility of birth could have added any thing to the *éclat* of his personal excellence, Thomas Aquinas was certainly not deficient in this respect. His biographers mention that he was son to Landulph, count of Aquino and lord of Loretto and Belcastro. His mother, Theodora, was daughter to the count of Theate. On the father's side he was nearly related to St. Louis, king of France, and to the last emperors of Germany, and connected with most of the royal houses of Europe; while on the mother's side

* He is also called *Doctor Angelicus*, *Scholæ Angelus*, *Aquila theologorum*.

he was of the house of Caraccioli, descended from the Norman princes who chased the Saracens and the Greeks from Italy.

Thomas was born at Rocca-Secca, in the kingdom of Naples, towards the end of the year 1226. The chroniclers tell us that it was perceived from his tenderest youth that he was destined for something wonderful. He was exempt, we are assured, from the ordinary defects and passions of childhood; the impatience, anger, jealousy, spite, and the like so commonly observable in children, were never noticed in him. "The severity of his countenance," says Alban Butler, "the constant evenness of his temper, his modesty and sweetness were sensible signs that his soul had received largely of the benediction of heaven."

Scarcely had he attained the age of five years, when his father took him to the Abbey of Mount Cassino to be instructed by the monks in the first principles of religion and education. His teachers were astonished at the rapidity of his progress, his great talents, and his happy dispositions to virtue. He was but ten years old when the abbot of Mount Cassino told his father it was time to send him to some university. The count of Aquino, before he sent him to Naples, took him for some months to see his mother at their seat at Loretto, the place which at the end of that century became so famous for devotion to the Virgin Mary.

Thomas was the admiration of the whole family. Amidst so much company and so many servants, he was as much occupied with heavenly things as when he was in the monastery. He spoke little, but we are told that what he said was always to the purpose; and he employed all his time in serious and profitable studies and exercises. His great delight was to plead the cause of the poor before his parents, who gave him the means of relieving them.

His mother, who, on account of his good qualities, was passionately attached to him, proposed to her husband that Thomas should continue his studies at home. She advanced as a reason that his innocence would be too much exposed to danger in the public schools; but the count was of a contrary opinion, and rejected the proposed measure; the advantages of a private education did not appear to him to counterbalance those which emulation and mutual communication in studies, afford to young persons. Accordingly he determined on sending his son to Naples, where the emperor Frederick II. had

founded a university. This prince had at that time forbidden students to resort to any university in Italy, as he was, for some cause, exasperated against Bologna. It therefore happened that great numbers of students resorted to Naples, and that disorder and licentiousness accompanied them.

Thomas soon perceived the danger to which he was exposed at Naples, and more than once regretted his absence from Mount Cassino; but the chroniclers of his time relate of him that by his watchfulness he lived at Naples like Daniel in the midst of Babylon; they tell us also that he guarded his eyes with great caution lest they should rest on any thing dangerous to his soul; that he shunned all conversation with women, and avoided with the greatest care all society with persons whose moral purity was suspected; and whilst his fellow-students went to profane diversions, he retired to his closet to study and pray, his only pleasures.

Thomas learned rhetoric under the celebrated Peter Martin. As to his course of philosophy, he studied it under Peter of Hibernia, one of the most learned men of the age. His progress was such, we are told, that he repeated the lessons more clearly than his teacher had explained them.

The Order of St. Dominic, who had himself been dead about twenty years, then abounded with men who were the ornament of the Church, by the eminent sanctity of their lives. The frequent conversations Thomas had with one of that body, filled his soul with devotion. The instructions he received from the good monk increased in him the contempt he had already conceived for the perishable things of this world. Finally, disgusted with the world more than ever, he determined to yield to the ardent desire he had of entering the Order of St. Dominic. His tutor perceived his inclinations, and informed the count, his father, of the matter, who omitted neither threats nor promises to defeat such a design; but all was useless. The young Thomas who knew, as one of his biographers says, that the voice of flesh and blood should not be listened to when God calls, persisted in his first resolution, and took the habit of the Dominicans at Naples in 1243, being then seventeen years old.

The countess, his mother, no sooner learned what had passed, than she hastened to Naples to disengage him if possible from that state of life. Thomas, on learning the object of her visit, begged his superiors to spare him the

conflicts he would have to encounter, by removing him away from Naples. His request was granted, and accordingly he was sent to the convent of St. Sabina in Rome. Afterwards he was sent to Paris, to be out of the reach of his relations, but did not arrive there for the following reasons :—

Two of his brothers, Landulph and Reynold, commanders in the emperor's army in Tuscany, so well guarded all the roads, by their mother's direction, that he fell into their hands near *Aqua-pendente*. They endeavoured to pull off his habit; but he resisted them with such perseverance, that they conducted him in it to the seat of his parents, at *Rocca-Secca*. The mother, overjoyed at their success, had no doubt of being able to overcome his resolution. She endeavoured to persuade him that, to join such an order against his parents' advice, could not be the call of heaven—adding all manner of reasons, fond caresses, entreaties, and tears. Nature made her eloquent and pathetic. He was deeply sensible of her affliction; but his resolution was not to be shaken. His answers were modest and respectful, but firm. At last, offended at his resistance, the countess expressed her displeasure in very choleric words, and ordered him to be more closely confined and guarded, and that no one should see him or speak to him but his two sisters.

The reiterated solicitations of the two young ladies were a long and violent assault. They omitted nothing that flesh and blood could inspire on such an occasion, and represented to him the danger of causing the death of his mother by grief. Thomas, however, remained unshaken in his resolution, and answered them only by touching discourses on contempt for the world, and the love of virtue. He spoke with so much energy that his sisters became much affected; he had even the satisfaction of seeing them enter into his sentiments, and devote themselves with zeal to the practice of piety. The conversion of his sisters did not a little contribute to soften the rigours of his captivity. He employed the greater part of his time in prayer and meditation; the rest of it he employed in reading books which some of the Dominicans conveyed to him through his sisters. These books were a Bible, the *Dialectics of Aristotle*, and the works of *Peter Lombard*, called the "*Master of the Sentences*."

Meanwhile, his two brothers, Landulph and Reynold, returned from the army. They found their mother in the greatest affliction, and the young novice triumphant in

his resolution. This circumstance, which, perhaps, they did not expect, caused them to resort to means reprov'd by humanity as well as by religion. They began the assault by shutting him up in a tower of the castle. They tore in pieces his habit, and after bitter reproaches and threats, they left him, hoping his confinement, and the mortification every one strove to give him, would have the desired effect.

He suffered this imprisonment and persecution without a murmur for a year, some authors say for two years, when at length the report of his sufferings reached the ears of Pope Innocent IV., and of the emperor Frederick II. These personages became much interested in his case, and remonstrated in his favour with the countess and his brothers, who soon began to relent in their harshness. We are told that the Dominicans of Naples, being informed of this, sent some disguised religious to the castle of Rocca-Secca where one of his sisters, knowing that the countess was no longer opposed to his escape, contrived his being let down out of the tower in a basket. His religious brethren received him into their arms and bore him with great joy to their convent in Naples.

Thomas made his religious profession the following year. His mother and brothers loudly disapproved of his profession, and going so far as to assign odious motives for the step he had taken, they carried their complaints to the pope. Thereupon, Innocent summoned the young novice to Rome and examined him in their presence, but was well pleased with his answers. The pontiff greatly admired his virtues, approved of the state of life he had chosen, and recommended to him to persevere in it. He was no longer annoyed by his family.

After a little time John the Teutonic, the general of the Order, went to Paris, and took Thomas with him. From thence they went to Cologne, where Albertus Magnus then taught with great reputation, and where Thomas became his pupil.

We will here make a slight digression in regard to Albert, as we think our readers would like to know something more of so famous a character than his mere name. He was born in 1193. His natal city was Laving, in Swabia, and his family that of the counts of Bollstadt. The surname of *Magnus* was not given him, as may well be conceived, on account of his stature, which was comparatively small, but on account of the greatness of his science and of his renown. His parents sent him to study

at Padua. About 1222, at the age of 28 or 29 years, he entered the Order of St. Dominic, and in the course of time, he became one of its most renowned professors.

Albertus was the wonder of his age, as well for his knowledge and discoveries in the physical sciences and arts, as for his great work on the philosophy of Aristotle, to which he consecrated six folio volumes—a work, by the way, which shows conclusively that he was not the blind or tame follower of the Greek philosopher, that some shallow writers have imagined him to be.

In 1254, he was elected provincial of his order for Germany. In the convents he visited in this capacity, his greatest care was in copying books. The pope sent him to Poland, in order to put an end to the barbarous custom that prevailed there of killing deformed children and invalid old people. After having declined many dignities which His Holiness offered him, he accepted the bishopric of Ratisbonne. But the administration of a diocese took too much time from the studies which he loved, and which had become a kind of necessity to him; so, after the third year, he resigned his bishopric, re-entered his convent at Cologne, and resumed his labours as a teacher and writer.

The chroniclers of the time relate two extraordinary facts in the life of Albertus. The first is, that, from being originally a dull and stupid youth, he suddenly became a person of amazing intellectual powers, so that he was for several years afterwards the light and the glory of his order. The second is, that, while in the pulpit, in the midst of a sermon, and without any apparent disease, he suddenly lost all his intellectual powers.

Such was the man whose lessons Thomas attended. All the time the duties of religion left him free, the disciple consecrated to study, retrenching part of that which was allowed for his meals and sleep—"not," as F. Weninger assures us, "from the desire of the applause of men, but for the advancement of God's honour and the interests of religion."* His humility made him conceal his perception and progress, so that his fellow-students thought he learned nothing, and on account of his reticence, called him, in derision, the Dumb Ox, or the Great Sicilian Ox. One of them, we are told, once offered to explain his lessons to him; he thankfully listened

* *Legende der Heiligen.*

although he was then capable of teaching the would-be instructor.

But his genius and learning were at last discovered, in spite of his endeavours to conceal them. His master, having propounded to him several questions on the most knotty and obscure points, his answers were such as to astonish the audience; and Albertus, unable to contain his admiration and joy, exclaimed: "We call Thomas the Dumb Ox; but one day he will give such a loud bellowing in learning, that it will be heard all over the world." This applause, we are told, excited no movement of vanity in the humble student. There was no change noticed in his conduct, because there was no change in his interior: it was always the same—the same simplicity, the same love for retirement, silence, and prayer. It was in the first year of his studies under Albertus, that he wrote his Commentaries on the Ethics of Aristotle.

The General Chapter of the Dominicans held at Cologne, in 1245, deputed Albertus to teach in Paris, in their college of St. James, which the University had given them. Thomas was sent with him to continue his studies under him, and there his talents shone with incredible splendour. Still his obedience was equal to his profound humility, as the following incident will show: one day, whilst he read in the refectory, the corrector bade him, by mistake, to pronounce a word with a false quantity, or, as some would say, incorrectly; and although he had pronounced it properly, and was aware of the fact, yet he readily obeyed. When told by his brethren, after dinner, that he ought to have persevered in giving it the right pronunciation, his answer was: "It matters but little how a word is pronounced; but to practise humility and obedience upon all occasions is of the greatest importance."

In 1248, being twenty-two years of age, he was appointed by the General Chapter to teach at Cologne, with his old master Albertus, whose high reputation he equalled in his first lessons. He then also began to publish his first works, which consist of commentaries on the ethics and other philosophical works of Aristotle. No one was more courteous and affable; but it was his practice to shun all unnecessary visits.

In his zeal for the salvation of others, Thomas did not forget his own relations. The lively interest he took in their welfare inspired him with the ardent desire of seeing them walk in the paths of justice. His exhortations, and

more particularly his example, exercised a powerful influence on them.

Thomas, after teaching four years at Cologne, was sent, in 1252, to Paris. His reputation for perspicuity and solidity drew immediately to his school a great number of students. It was with great reluctance, and only in virtue of obedience, that he consented to receive, in October, 1257, the degree of Doctor, being then only thirty-one years old.

The manner of teaching then was not as it is, in general, at present, by dictating lessons which the students write; but it was according to the practice that still obtains partly in some schools, and particularly in medical colleges. The master delivered his explanation like a harangue, the students retaining what they could, and often taking notes to help their memory.

Academical degrees were also different then from what they now are, being conferred on none but those who taught. To be a Master of Arts, a person must have studied six years at least, and be twenty-one years old; and to be qualified for teaching divinity, he must have studied eight years more, and be at least thirty-five years old. Nevertheless, Thomas, by a dispensation of the University, on account of his distinguished learning and merit, was allowed to teach at twenty-five. The usual way was for one named a bachelor, to explain the "Master of the Sentences" for one year in the school of some doctor, upon whose testimony after certain rigorous public examinations and other formalities, the bachelor was admitted to the degree of licentiate, which gave him the right of teaching as a Doctor. He employed the second year in expounding the Master of the Sentences, after which he received from the Chancellor of the University the degree of Doctor.

The learned were not the only persons that rendered justice to the rare merit of Thomas. St. Louis, king of France, had great confidence in his enlightened judgment, and asked his advice upon the most important state affairs. He invited him often to his table, an honour which the humble Dominican declined as often as it was possible. When, however, he was obliged to accept it, he appeared at court as unpretending and as self-possessed as when he was in his convent. It is related of him, that being one day at the king's table, the following incident occurred: He had been for some time engaged in refuting the doctrine of the Bulgarians or New Manichees, which

had recently been renewed in Italy. His head being full of the matter, and his mind intensely occupied with the profound reflections he had been making, he suddenly cried out: "The argument is conclusive against the Manichees."* His prior who was with him bade him remember where he was. Thomas would have begged pardon of the king, but that prince, fearing that the theologian would forget the argument that had occurred to his mind, caused his own secretary to write it down for him.

Thomas assisted at the thirty-sixth chapter of his order, which was held in 1259 at Valencennes. There he was deputed, conjointly with Albertus Magnus and three other doctors, to draw up rules for studies, which are still extant in the acts of that chapter. Returning to Paris he there continued his teaching.

Pope Urban IV., who knew his merit, called him, in 1261, to Rome, and by his order the general appointed him to teach there. That pontiff wished several times to raise him to ecclesiastical dignities, but Thomas refused them all, preferring the state of a simple religious to that of dignities which, according to Rohrbacher, ambition would have coveted less, if it were capable of knowing the dangers that surround them.† The pope, however, obliged him to attend his person, and that was all he could obtain of him. Thus it was that he taught and preached in all the towns where that pontiff resided, as in Rome, Viterbo, Orvieto, Fondi, Perugia. He also taught at Bologna, Naples, &c.

The Dominicans having held their fortieth general chapter in London in the year 1273, Thomas assisted at it, and soon after retired from teaching. He now rejoiced to see himself reduced to the state of a private religious man. Pope Clement IV. had such a regard for him that, in 1265, among other ecclesiastical preferments, he made him an offer of the archbishopric of Naples, but could not prevail on him to accept that or any other. It was at Bologna that he wrote the first part of his theological *Summa*.

From December, in 1273, until the 7th of March following, the day of his death, he neither wrote nor dictated anything on theological matters. From that time he laid aside his studies, to fix his thoughts on eternity. Pope Gregory X. had called a general council at Lyons,

* *Conclusum est contra Manicheos.*

† *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique.*

with the view of extinguishing the Greek schism, and raising succors to defend the Holy Land against the Saracens. The ambassadors of Michael Palæologus, together with the Greek prelates, were to assist at it, and it was to meet on the first of May, in 1274. His Holiness, by a brief directed to Thomas, ordered him to repair thither, to defend the Catholic cause against the Greek schismatics.

Though indisposed, Thomas set out from Naples to attend the council. Proceeding on his journey, he was forced, by his increasing fever, to stop at Fossa-Nuava, a famous abbey of the Cistercians; and, passing into the cloister, he repeated these words, from Psalm cxxxi:—*This is my rest, for ages without end.* The good monks treated him with uncommon veneration. He had continually in his mouth the words of St. Augustine: "Then shall I truly live when I shall be filled with Thee alone and Thy love: now I am a burden to myself, because I am not full of Thee." It was in this abode, consecrated to religion, that Thomas yielded up his spirit, on the 7th of March, 1274, in the fiftieth, or, as some say, the forty-eighth year of his age.

Thomas was very tall, and every way proportionably well made. The concourse of people at his funeral was extraordinary. The University of Paris sent to the general and provincial of the Dominicans a letter of condolence upon his death, giving the highest commendations to his learning and sanctity, and begging his body as a treasure. Naples, Rome, and many other universities, princes, and orders, contended no less for it. After several contestations, Pope Urban V., many years after Thomas's death, granted his body to the Dominicans to carry to Paris or Toulouse, as Italy had already possessed the body of St. Dominic, at Bologna. It was received at Toulouse in the most honourable manner, and it rests there in the Dominicans' church, in a rich shrine, with a stately mausoleum over it. Finally, he was solemnly canonized by Pope John XXII., in the year 1323. Pope Pius V., in 1567, ordered his festival and office to be kept equal with those of the four doctors of the Western church.

The writings of St. Thomas will now briefly engage our attention. These writings are partly theological and partly philosophical, with some commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, and several treatises on piety. It is his philosophical works that we desire particularly to notice: respecting his theological ones, except as regards

their literary aspect or form, and a few other points, we will, of course, have nothing to say, as it does not fall within our scope.

St. Thomas follows the scholastic method of teaching. But in what does this scholastic method consist? It consists in this: to have a clear and precise idea of what one teaches: for this purpose, to lay down certain principles and deduce from them their consequences by just reasonings; to employ only clear and distinctly defined terms; to avoid useless digressions, vague ideas, and equivocal terms; lastly, to put the whole in such an order that the questions will be mutually elucidated or explained by each other. Such is the scholastic method, and such also is the method of teaching geometry, so that the scholastic is nothing more or less than the geometric method.

In his *Summa* of theology, St. Thomas commences each article with the difficulties against the truth or dogma in question; afterwards he gives an exposition of the truth or dogma, followed by its proofs, and then answers the difficulties or objections. It is a remarkable fact that modern infidels have not been able to find a single difficulty or objection against Christianity that St. Thomas has not anticipated in his great work, and, we may add, triumphantly refuted. It is, in truth, from Thomas Aquinas that these gentlemen have stolen almost all their thunder; but they have taken good care not to bring forward his irrefutable arguments and answers.*

We now proceed to give his views about the origin of society—a very important question, inasmuch as it is, and must be, the basis of public law and government. Let us hear the calm and profound views of St. Thomas on the subject. “If man,” he says, “was designed to live alone, like many animals, he would not require any person to govern him; every man would be his own king, under the supreme command of God; inasmuch as he would govern himself by the light of reason given him by his Creator. But it is in the nature of man to be a social and political being, living in community, differently from all other animals—a thing which is clearly shown by the necessities of his nature. Nature has provided for other animals food; hairy skins for their raiment; means of defence, as teeth,

* “La *Somme de Saint Thomas*,” says M. Cousin, “est un des grands monuments de l’esprit humain au moyen âge, et comprend, avec une haute métaphysique, un système entier de morale et même de politique.—*Cours de l’Hist. de la philos.*, 9^e leçon.

horns, claws,—or, at least, speed in flight; but she has not endowed man with any of these qualities, and instead she has given him reason, by which, with the aid of his hands, he can procure what he wants. But, to procure this, one man alone is not sufficient; for he is not in a condition to preserve his own life; it is, therefore, in man's nature to live in society. Moreover, nature has granted to other animals the power of discerning what is useful, or injurious to them: thus, the sheep has a natural horror of its enemy the wolf. There are also certain animals that know by nature the herbs which are medicinal to them, and other things which are necessary for their preservation. But man has not naturally the knowledge which is necessary for the support of life, except in society; inasmuch as the aid of reason is capable of leading from universal principles to the knowledge of particular things which are necessary for life. Thus, then, since it is impossible for man alone to obtain all this knowledge, it is necessary that he should live in society, one person aiding another, each one performing his own task; for example, some in medicine, some in one way, and some in another. This is shown with great clearness in that faculty peculiar to man, language,—which enables him to communicate his thoughts to others. Indeed, brute animals mutually communicate their feelings to each other, as the dog expresses his anger by barking, and other animals their passions in various ways. But man, with respect to his fellows, is more communicative than any other animal, even than those which are most inclined to live in a gregarious state, as cranes, ants, and bees. In this sense Solomon says, in Ecclesiastes: 'It is better, therefore, that two should be together than one, for they have the advantage of their society.' Hence, if it is natural for man to live in society, it is necessary that some one should direct the multitude; for if many were united, and each one did as he thought proper, they would fall to ruin, unless somebody looked after the public good, as would be the case with the human body, and that of any other animal, if there did not exist a power to watch over the welfare of all the members. It is for these reasons that Solomon says: 'Where there is no one to govern, the people will be dispersed.' In man himself the soul directs the body; and in the soul, the feelings of anger and concupiscence are governed by reason. In like manner, among the members of the body, there is one principal one

which directs and governs all the others, as the heart or the head. There ought, therefore, to be in every multitude of people a governing power."

It has been imagined by many, that ideas that were very common in the Middle Ages are the marvellous discoveries of modern genius. How often does not our age glorify itself in having discovered the boon of representative government? With certain French and English writers the marvel is of a constitutional monarchy, tempered with an aristocracy and a democracy, and yet all that is so old that St. Thomas recognized it as already existing in the divine government of the Hebrews. Let us hear him speak:—

"As regards the good constitution of princes or of chiefs of a city or of a nation, it is necessary to pay attention to two things: the first is, that all should have a certain part in the government; thus the peace of the people is preserved, and all love, and uphold such a constitution, as it is said in the second book of the *Politics* of Aristotle. The other point regards the kind of government, or the diversity of manner of constituting the princes or chiefs. There are divers kinds of them, as has been remarked by the same philosopher, in the third book of his *Politics*. However, that is especially a government where one alone governs according to virtue; and an aristocracy, that is to say, the government of the best men, where some few govern according to virtue. The best constitution of princes or chiefs in a city or in a kingdom, is, therefore, where a single person is proposed according to virtue to preside over all, where some others govern under him according to virtue; and still this government appertains to all, as well because the chiefs may be elected from among the whole people, as because they are, in fact, elected by the whole people. This kind of government is the best, being well mixed with royalty, inasmuch as only one presides:—with aristocracy, inasmuch as several govern according to virtue; and with democracy, that is to say, with the power of the people, inasmuch as the princes may be elected from among the men of the people, and that to the people it appertains to elect the princes. And see what was instituted according to the divine law."

Such is the doctrine as regards the best of political institutions, and we are happy to have to say that we can see no material difference between it and our own. It matters not what name you give the chief, whether king, prince, or president, when the power is the same, and he is chosen, or in modern parlance, elected by the people mediately or immediately. And what matters it, what name you give the tempering power between the chief ruler and the people, whether you call it an aristocracy, a parliament, or a senate? By aristocracy St. Thomas understood, as may have been noticed, men distinguished, not for their rank or opulence, but for their *virtue*, or as we would at this day say, moral goodness, or moral ex-

cellence, and also for their capability. In short, we know no country, in which St. Thomas's idea of a good form of government is so much realized as in our own, at least in theory. All the strictly monarchical governments in the civilized world, be it remembered, are more or less hereditary, since the fall of unhappy Poland.

In modern times there has been a great dispute in regard to the origin of political power, some maintaining that it comes from the people, and others that it comes from God. The publicists of the Middle Ages had no dispute on this point; they united that which is now divided; they unanimously taught that political and legislative power comes from God through the people.*

Some persons who have not thoroughly examined the matter, or have done so through polluted sources, have rashly concluded that what are called *passive obedience to tyrants*, and *non-resistance to tyrants* were the received political dogmas of the Middle Ages. But such was not the fact, as St. Thomas, who may be considered as a fair exponent of the views of those ages in these matters, shows conclusively in several parts of his writings. But these subjects are of too extensive a character to receive further notice in the limited space at our disposal.

St. Thomas held that intelligences understand by a smaller number of ideas, in proportion to the superiority of their order; thus, that angels have fewer than men, and archangels fewer than angels, and that thus they continue diminishing until in God, the Supreme Intelligence, there is but one idea,—the idea, *par excellence*, which is his own essence, the infinite idea, the idea which includes all ideas.

Those who have studied the history of philosophy, need not be told of the inky wars that have been waged in the schools on the *origin of ideas*. The doctrines of the materialists and of the sensists on this subject are too well known to need being mentioned here. Therefore, we will content ourselves with reproducing one or two brief passages from St. Thomas on this rather knotty question. He states that first principles, speculative as well as practical, must be naturally communicated to us:—*"Oportet igitur naturaliter nobis esse indita, sicut principia speculabilium, ita et principia operabilium."*†

In another passage, enquiring whether the soul knows immaterial things in their eternal reasons (in rationibus

* Suarez, *De legib.* l. 3. c. 2. † Pars. I. 2, lxxix. A. 12.

æternis), he writes, that the intellectual light which is within us, is nothing else than a participated likeness of the increased light in which the eternal reasons are contained: "*Ipsū enim lumen intellectuāle, quod est in nobis nihil est aliud, quā quādā participatā similitudo luminis increatē, in quo continentur rationes æternæ.*"*

Some persons think that it was the German philosopher, Kant, who discovered the fact of the indeterminateness of the substance of the human soul, but this supposed recent discovery turns out, like many others, to be an old one, as may be seen in the writings of Thomas. Proposing to himself the question whether the intellectual soul knows itself by its essence; after various observations on intelligence, and the intelligibility of objects, he answers:—

"It is not, therefore, by its essence, but by its acts that the understanding knows itself, and that in two ways. One way, in particular, according to which Plato or Socrates perceives that he has an intellectual soul from the fact that he perceives he understands; the second way, in general, inasmuch as we consider the nature of the human mind in the intellectual act. But it is true that we derive the judgment and efficacy of the knowledge by which we know the nature of the soul, by the light of the divine truth of which our intellect participates, and in which are contained the reasons of all things, as was said above. Hence, Augustine says, in the ninth book on the Trinity: We have intuition of the inviolable truth by which we perfectly determine, as far as possible, not what the mind of each man is, but what it should be according to eternal reasons. But there is a difference between these two cognitions, for to have the first, we need only the presence of the mind, which is the principle of the act by which the mind perceives itself; and, therefore, we say that it knows itself by its presence; but for the second, the presence of the mind is not sufficient, but a careful and subtle investigation is necessary. Hence, many are ignorant of the nature of the soul; wherefore, Augustine, in the tenth book on the Trinity, in reference to this investigation, says: The soul should not try to see itself as something absent, but endeavour to discern itself as something present; that is, to know its difference from other things, which is to know its essence (*quidditatem*) and nature."†

Another of Kant's discoveries, to wit, the divisions of judgments into analytic and synthetic, one so much lauded for the new light it has brought into the intellectual world, turns out likewise to be an old discovery, the newness of the thing being merely in the change of terms. In the scholastic writers, we find the distinction made between the two kinds of judgment. The following extracts from Thomas Aquinas will place the matter beyond cavil:—

* Pars. 2. L. xxxiv. A. 5. † Summ. Pars. I. 2, lxxxvii. A. 1.

"A proposition is known by itself, *per se nota*, when the predicate is contained in the subject, as, *man is an animal*; for animal is of the essence of man. If, then, it is known to all what the subject and predicate are, that proposition will be known to all by itself, as is seen in the first principles of demonstration, which are certain common things, not unknown to any one, as being and not being the whole, the part and thus similar."^{*}

"Any proposition the predicate of which is of the essence of the subject is known by itself, although such a proposition is not known by itself to any one who is ignorant of the definition of the subject. Thus, the proposition *man is rational*, is by its nature known by itself, for whoever says *man* says *rational*.[†]

His teaching on the subject of *evil* cannot be considered hackneyed or common-place, and therefore we will the more readily make room for an analysis of it.

According to the universal acceptance of the word, evil is the privation of a thing, which from his having been born, one ought to have. If man has not wings it is not an evil to him, he is not born to have them. But if he has not hands, it is an evil for him because naturally he ought to have them if he is perfect, whilst it would not be evil for a bird. It is thus that this word is understood by all mankind. Now, privation is not an essence, but a negation in the substance. Evil is not then a real essence. This is what totally overthrows the error of the Manichees, who suppose that there are things which are in their nature evil.[‡] Hence, it follows that evil is caused only by something that is good. That which has no existence, can be the cause of nothing. It is necessary, therefore, that every cause must be some being. Now, evil is not any thing whatsoever, but a privation; evil, therefore, cannot be the cause of any thing. If, therefore evil has a cause, this cannot be but something that is good.[§] Hence, it follows also, that evil is founded on something that is good, for evil cannot exist by itself, having no essential existence. It must be the case, then, that evil is in some subject. Now, every subject, being a certain substance, is something that is good. Therefore every evil is in something that is good.

St. Thomas sounds and illumines these matters with so rare a sagacity, that he sometimes arrives at conclusions as surprising for their justness as for their novelty. "It has been asked," he says, "If there is a God, whence comes evil? We should rather conclude thus: If there is evil, there is a God, for evil would have no existence

^{*} Summa Theologica, P. La. 2. 2d A. 1 in corp. † La., 2d, 2 94a, A. 2d, in corp.

[‡] Contra Gent. 7 and 6.

[§] Ibid. cap. 10.

[Cap. 11.

without order in the good, the privation of which is evil. But there would not be this order, if God did not exist.”*

Surely, every Christian soul that can fully comprehend his meaning will be pleased with what, in another place, he says of the Eternal Word. He proposes to himself the question: Whether any relation to creature is signified in the name of the Word: *Utrum in nomine Verbi importetur respectus ad creaturam*; and he answers thus: “I reply, that in the Word, relation to creature is signified. For God, in knowing himself, knows every creature. The Word, therefore, conceived in the mind, is representative of all that is understood by it. Wherefore, there are in us different words according to the different things we understand. But because God, by one act, understands both himself and all things, His only Word is expressive not only of the Father, but also of creatures. And as the science of God is, with respect to himself, cognition, but with respect to creatures cognition and cause, so the Word of God is expressive only of what is in God the Father, but both expressive and productive of creatures; and this is why it is said in the thirty-second Psalm, ‘He said, and they were made;’ because the productive reason of those things, which the Father makes, is contained in the Word.”†

In truth, we know not which most to admire in the writings of the illustrious Doctor, whether their profundity, their sublimity, or their calm, majestic beauty. We will conclude our extracts from them with his admirable portraiture of a true sage, and would simply remark that, in our estimation, he was himself one of its most noble realizations. We quote textually the first chapter of the Introduction to his work, *Contra Gentiles* :—

“‘What is the duty of a sage?’ ‘My heart shall meditate truth and my lips shall hate wickedness.’‡

“Universal usage, which the philosopher, that is to say, Aristotle § decides we must follow in naming things, generally requires that we should call sages those who directly ordain or dispose affairs, and who govern them well. Hence, among other things that men conceive of the sage, the philosopher concludes that it is the part of the sage to ordain. Now, of every thing that is to be governed or ordained for a special end, it is necessarily from that end the rule of government and of ordinance should be taken, because then every thing is disposed for the best when it is suitably ordained for its end. In reality the end, the object of every thing, is the good. Hence we see that in the arts one governs another, and that he is as it were the ruler of him to whom the end in view appertains.||

* Lib. iii., c. 71, n. 7. † Summ., P. 1, 2, 34, A. 3. ‡ Prov. viii.

§ Aristotle, 2 Top. || In præm. metaphys., c. 2.

"Thus medicine governs pharmacy and ordains it, because health, with which medicine is concerned, is the object of all the medicaments which pharmacy prepares. It is the same thing with the act of the pilot in regard to him who builds ships; with the captain in regard to the armorer. Experts in those arts that govern others receive the name of sages. But as those artists who pursue certain particular things for particular ends do not attain the universal end of things, they are called sages in this or that department, as it is said, '*as a wise architect I have laid the foundation.*'*" But the absolute name of sage is reserved for him alone whose consideration is occupied with the end of the universe, because this end of the universe is also its origin. Hence, according to the philosopher, it is the concern of the sage to consider the highest cause.

"Now, the final cause of every thing is that which its author and creator proposed to himself. The prime author and mover of the universe is intelligence, as will be shown further on. The final end of the world must therefore be the good of intelligence. But this good is the truth. It must be the case, then, that truth is the final end of the whole universe, and that wisdom insists principally upon this end, and upon its consideration. It is for this reason that the divine wisdom having assumed flesh testifies that he came into this world for the manifestation of the truth, saying: '*For this I was born, and for this I came into the world that I might give testimony to the truth.*'†

"The philosopher himself decides that the highest philosophy is the truth, not of any truth, whatever it may be, but that truth which is the source of all truth; that is, of that which concerns the principle of the being of all things, in such a manner, that its especial truth is the principle of every truth; for the disposition of things is the same in truth as it is in being. Now, in contraries, it is the same thing to sustain one, or to refute the others, as medicine restores health and expels disease. Thus as it is the part of the sage to meditate truth, especially in regard to the first principle, so it is his part to impugn the contrary falsehood.

"It is meetly, then, that from the very mouth of wisdom two duties of the sage are signalized in the words of our text; one, to meditate and announce the divine truth, the truth by excellence, in saying: '*my heart shall meditate the truth*, the other, to impugn the falsehood contrary to the truth, when it says: '*my lips shall hate wickedness*,' by which it designates the falsehood contrary to the divine truth, to religion, which is called piety, whilst the contrary falsehood receives the name of impiety."

The reader must have noticed how frequently St. Thomas quotes Aristotle, or simply, the philosopher as he frequently calls him. The reason of this will be found in the following circumstance. It is well known that Plato and Aristotle were the chiefs of pagan philosophy. The elegance of Plato gave his philosophy the greater vogue among the gentiles; and the most learned of the Christian fathers were, according to Alban Butler, educated in the maxims of his school. His noble sentiments on the attributes of the Deity, and particularly on Divine

* 1 Cor. iii. 10.

† John xviii. 37.

Providence, and his doctrine of the rewards and punishments of a future state seemed favourable to religion. And it cannot be doubted that he had learned in the course of his travels in Egypt and Phœnicia, many traditional truths delivered down from the patriarchal ages, which the corruption of idolatry had not wholly concealed or banished.

On the other hand, the philosophy of Aristotle was much in esteem among the Heathen; was silent as to all traditional truths, and contained some glaring errors, which several opponents of Christianity adopted against the religion of the gospel. It must, however, be acknowledged by all impartial judges, that Aristotle was the greatest and most comprehensive genius of antiquity, and that he was the only one that had laid down complete rules for, and explained the laws of, reasoning; and that he had given a thorough system of philosophy. It appears that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Peter Abelard and others made a bad use of Aristotle's philosophy. But above all, the Mahometans of Spain and Arabia wrote with incredible subtilty on his principles.

It was with their own weapons that St. Thomas opposed those enemies of the truth, and employed the philosophy of Aristotle in defence of the faith, in which he succeeded in a wonderful manner. He discerned and confuted Aristotle's errors, and set in a new and clear light the great truths of reason which that philosopher had enveloped in obscurity. Thus Aristotle, who was called the terror of Christians, "became" as Alban Butler says, "in the hands of Thomas, orthodox, and furnished faith with new arms against idolatry and atheism," for this admirable Doctor has corrected his errors, and shown that his whole subtle system of philosophy, as far as it is grounded on truth, is subservient to the cause of revelation.

This, Thomas has done through the nicest metaphysical speculations. He everywhere strikes out a new track for himself, and enters into the most secret recesses of their shadowy region, so as to appear new even on known and common place subjects. For his writings are original efforts of genius and reflection, and every point he treats in a manner to make it appear new. If his speculations are sometimes fine-spun, and his divisions run into niceties, it was in a great measure owing to the speculative and refining genius of the Arabians,

whom he had undertaken to pursue and confute through-out their whole system. But part of them no doubt must be attributed to the age in which he lived.

It would be highly interesting, did our space permit, to draw parallels between St. Thomas and some cotemporary philosophers, and especially Kant and Hegel. Let it suffice for this time, to observe that the language of these two German philosophers is so different from common language, or that they attach such uncommon meanings to the terms they use, that during their lifetime, and after their death, there was and has been the greatest contention in regard to their meaning, and that there are no two of their disciples who understand them in the same manner. It is the same confusion of words and ideas there was at Babel, but with different instincts. At Babel the object was to build up, here it was to pull down, to subvert—to subvert all truths, all institutions, divine as well as human—to put in their place nobody knows what. Far be it from us to judge of their intentions; we speak of the evident tendency of their systems.

How different is the case with the Neapolitan Doctor. The terms he uses are always in their common acceptation; he has no verbiage, no pompous expressions or phrases, and upon every subject he treats, he sheds new and important light, often, indeed, unexpected and astonishing, but always clear and convincing. And as to the tendency of his doctrine, or, if you will, his philosophy, it manifestly is not to deny or weaken, but, on the contrary, to assert and uphold every truth, no matter whether it is one that is divinely revealed, or one that pertains simply to the natural order.

-
- ART. VI.—1. *Histoire de la Caricature Antique*; par CHAMPFLEURY. Deuxième Edition, très-augmentée. Paris: E. Dentu, 1867.
2. *Histoire de la Caricature Moderne*; par CHAMPFLEURY. Paris: E. Dentu, 1867.
3. *The Man in the Moon*. Edited by ALBERT SMITH and ANGUS B. REACH. London: Clarke, 1847-1848
3. *Punch; or, The London Charivari*. Vols I.-LIII. London, 1841-1868.

WHEN Fadladeen was called upon to give Lalla Rookh his critical opinion upon "The Veiled Prophet of Khorassan," he began by saying that in order to con-

vey with clearness his opinion of the story which Feramorz had related, "it would be necessary to take a review of all the stories that had ever—" but he was called to order, and requested to speak only of the poem he had just heard. In like manner, were we to commence an article upon satirical literature, we should have to go back through the evanished ages, and this whole number would be filled with even the merest preliminary summary of the subject. If, added to this, we should treat satire illustrated by art, no reader would have perseverance to go through the record, or patience to wait until we came down to the present era. Therefore, content with endeavouring to convey some correct idea of satirical composition, pointed by caricature, we shall say little of the past. But we may mention that the ancients struck boldly, "with trenchant blade," as Spenser says, at the vices and follies of the time, and that Aristophanes and Lucian, Horace and Juvenal, have not been even approached, in after days, by any imitators. The satire of the present time, however lively and piquant, does not possess that strength which is the main element of vitality, and, as compared with the productions of the old writers, whose words were weapons, remind us only of the little arrows discharged by the gallant soldiers of Lilliput at the face of Lemuel Gulliver, which pricked him "like so many needles," but inflicted not the slightest permanent personal injury. The satire of the present age owes its point chiefly to the art of design. The text, separated from the comic illustrations, is usually tame and dull. The great humorists of antiquity, still read and relished for their wit and truth, were not given to the world with "choice engravings from designs by the most eminent comic artists."

Caricature, which implies exaggeration, can boast of great antiquity. Examples of it, from Assyria and Egypt, have been discovered in abundance. Pliny mentioned a Greek statue of a drunken woman, extremely like one of the old Egyptian drawings copied by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, and Lepsius published, in his great work on Egypt, a plate in which he reproduced some satirical drawings upon papyrus—now in the British Museum and in the Museum of Turin. The drawings in Turin, M. Théodule Devéna states, remain on the *débris* of a roll of papyrus, and their style closely resembles that of Grandville, the modern French caricaturist, who sketched human beings as animals, precisely as had been done in Egypt two thousand years

ago. Copies of these pictorial satires, from the plates of Lepsius, are given in the volume whose title heads our list, and are spirited and artistical. In the Old World, generally, satirical drawings of great antiquity remain.

The Greeks, not content with caricaturing Socrates, who bore it patiently, and the extremely ugly poet Hipponax, who retorted in cutting verse, did not spare royalty itself, and even drew burlesque sketches of Jupiter and Bacchus. There is a fresco in the Casa Carolina, at Pompeii, which represents a painter at work on a portrait in his *atelier*; it has seven figures, very small, but veritable caricatures, and the easel is shaped exactly like that now used by all painters. A fresco, of the story of Æneas and Anchises, in which the future founder of the Latin nation, bearing his father on his shoulders, and dragging his son after him by the hand, is represented—all three made to resemble animals—was discovered at Gragnano in 1760, and, curiously enough, is an undoubted burlesque of a marble group now in the Museum of Florence. But we need go no further with this part of our subject. Of course, no archaeologist or connoisseur will acknowledge as genuine the extremely apocryphal fresco, pretended to have been found in Greece, some forty years ago, entitled, Ἐχὰς παῖ καλέ, which represents an author following Fame, who, as she runs away, with a laurel wreath in one hand, holds the other up to her face, the thumb of its extended palm saucily applied to her nose, in the fashion familiarly entitled, "taking a sight."

The Greek legend was supposed to have been Fame's taunting exclamation. Some believers in the antiquity of this design were found, but it was a French quiz, probably suggested by a passage in Rabelais.

Our introduction is growing so long that we must check all desire to show what modern caricature has done in Continental Europe, in conjunction with written satire. Germany has several illustrated satirical journals. Italy has the *Fischietto*; and *Figaro*, the *Charivari*, and the *Journal pour Rire* have long flourished in France. Under the first Empire caricature was not safely exercised. One of the best hits was at Prince Borghese, who had married Napoleon's sister, Pauline. The prince was quiet and contented, obese and good-natured, but remarkably dull. The satirist placed him in the centre of a group of jackasses whom he regarded with peculiar self-complacency, exclaiming: "Où peut-on être mieux qu'au sein de sa famille?" (where can one be happier

than in the bosom of his own family ?) which was the burden of a French song, very popular at the time.

The modern French caricaturists may be said to have first shown themselves during the reign of Louis Philippe. The principal, most of whom have contributed to the satirical journals, are Honoré Daumier, who first exhibited Louis Philippe as *Robert Macaire*; Charles Joseph Traviès de Villiers, who invented the type of *Mayeux*, corresponding with the Oriental *Karagueuz* and the Italian *Polichinello*; Henry Monnier, who created the types of *Madame Gibou* and *Joseph Prudhomme*, and Messieurs Charles Philipon, Pigal, Grandville, and Gavarni—the actual patronymic of the last of these was Sulpice-Paul Chevalier, just as Amadeus de Noe was better known during the last twenty years of his life as *Cham*, than by his true surname.

Caricature, or comic sarcastic art, cannot be regarded as having flourished in England until the time of George the Second. The first master in that line was William Hogarth. His "Marriage-à-la-Mode," now in the National Gallery of England, was a striking and satirical series, directed against the loose morals and bad manners of the time. The comedy of "The Clandestine Marriage," by the elder Colman and David Garrick, was professedly founded upon Hogarth's paintings; we use the names of Colman and Garrick in conjunction, because the dramatist and the actor united to produce that play. The part of Lord Ogleby, the most original part in the play, has generally been attributed to Garrick, though he refused to perform it. The younger Colman acknowledged, on his father's authority, that Garrick's share was a revision of the comedy, and the invention of the incidents in the last act where the various characters are brought forward from their beds to produce an explanation and the catastrophe. "The Rake's Progress," another well-known series by Hogarth, and his "Industry and Idleness" (the pictorial history of a good and a bad apprentice), were dramatized in our own time, with effect and success. The last-named series, though it has many comic points, is, indeed, a highly tragic history.

These performances, however, do not strictly belong to what is called caricature. Neither does "The Harlot's Progress." His illustrations to "Hudibras" first indicated Hogarth's decidedly satiric spirit, and are worthy of Butler's poetry, graphic as that is, and full of images of fun and humour. "The March to Finchley" might

have done duty as a scene in which our own militia of the last century were quizzed. Hogarth aimed at an eminent mark when, in "Burlington Gate," he ridiculed Pope, the poet, and Kent, the architect. "The Sleeping Congregation," and "The Distrest Poet," were bold hits at the social life of the time, and "The Enraged Musician," though designed to illustrate a passing event, is as racy as ever after more than a century. The most amusing of Hogarth's works is "The Strolling Actresses," full of life and fun. His portrait of Churchill, the satirist, as a bear, won the town to laugh with him, and his well-known likeness of John Wilkes, the result of an attack on Hogarth, in "The North Briton," though somewhat exaggerated, holds its ground as the best likeness of the great demagogue ever made. Hogarth added a few touches to a portrait of Wilkes which impressed the man's vices on the canvas, bringing out the sensuality of his character. It is said that, when finished, the painter, remembering his former friendship for Wilkes, threw it in the fire, from which his wife snatched it. In later years, so thorough was the actual likeness, that Wilkes, who could jest at his own expense, wrote in a letter to a friend, "I am growing every day more and more like my portrait by Hogarth."

Between the death of Hogarth in 1764, and the reign of Bunbury and Gilray, a long interval occurred. Henry William Bunbury, born in 1750, died in 1811, was second son of the Rev. William Bunbury. The baronetcy, conferred by Charles II. in 1681, is now held by the caricaturist's grandson. It was Bunbury's double misfortune to be above the necessity of working for his bread, and to use the pencil without being able to draw well. He was a genuine and would have been a great caricaturist, if his hand had been able to respond to the demands of his imagination. He drew faces with spirit and truth, and was at least tolerable when dealing with the human figure,—so long as it was arrayed in shapeless breeches, broad-skirted and loosely-hanging coats, capacious vests, grizzly perukes, and surrounded with an atmosphere of tobacco smoke. He drew men and women with as much sameness as if he were stereotyping them. A want of individuality is the great drawback on most of Bunbury's performances, and his accessories—cattle, furniture, and landscape—were sketchy, as well as generally incorrect. He was a great amateur, now and then showing unexpected ability. One of his pieces is the "Propagation of

a Lie;" representing a long line of well-dressed people, "each in his turn adding something to a rumor, until it finally is swollen into a circumstantial falsehood; every successive face, with a new expression, rising in the scale, from silliness to craft, from craft to mystery, and from mystery to the broad-faced impudence that delighted in a conscious fabrication." In the purely comic line, Bunbury's "Barber's Shop" is so excellent that neither Hogarth nor Cruikshank has surpassed it, either in imagination or execution. It is a show of faces in numerous varieties of being shaved: some, in the torture of beards rough as scrubbing-brushes, harshly dealt with by blunt razors—others with every feature enveloped in soap-suds—some rejoicing in the (perhaps unaccustomed) sensation of a perfectly smooth shave—more complacently gazing in the looking-glass at their improved looks. These, one might think, are scanty and intractable materials for the artist. But he has subdued the commonplace, and made it striking as well as real. A line, a dot, sometimes the mere "shadow of a shade," gives a feature or an expression with telling effect.

James Gilray, who flourished from 1780 to 1811, during which time he produced over twelve hundred satirical works, may be regarded as founder and master of personal pictorial satire in England. He was a Scotchman, who went as a journeyman engraver to London. He was a stout, bluff, muscular man, of low stature, in all respects deficient in and negligent of "the Graces," which Lord Chesterfield esteemed more highly than the Virtues. His brow was broad and bold; his eyes deep-seated and stormy; his voice harsh and angry; his habits of life the reverse of refined. He had been unfortunate at home, and was scarcely more so in London. Conscious of ability, and angry because it was not recognized, he naturally fell into vigorous satire, and his first performance in that line had certain lords and ladies of the court for their object. They were accidentally seen; and some politician, perceiving how useful such a talent might be for party purposes, gave him employment. Sir T. Erskine May, describing the first administration of the Duke of Portland (known as the Coalition Ministry; it included Lord North and Charles James Fox, political enemies during many years; was formed in April, 1783, and was dissolved by Mr. Pitt's coming into power in December the same year), says:—"Nor is it unworthy of remark, that art had come to the aid of letters in political contro-

versy. Since the days of Walpole, caricatures had occasionally portrayed ministers in grotesque forms and with comic incidents; but, during this period, caricaturists had begun to exercise no little influence upon popular feeling. The broad humour and bold pencil of Gilray had contributed to foment the excitement against Mr. Fox and Lord North; and this skilful limner elevated caricature to the rank of a new art. The people were familiarized with the persons and characters of public men; crowds gathered round the printsellers' windows; and as they passed on, laughing good-humoredly, felt little awe or reverence for rulers whom the caricaturist had made ridiculous. The press had found a powerful ally, which, first used in the interests of party, became a further element of popular force."*

For more than twenty years, Gilray had no rival in the art which he had almost created. He was consistent, too, in his politics, and, throughout his long career, laughed at the Whigs. He had great facility of invention and execution, and remarkable aptitude for seeing and seizing the salient points of a subject. When the Whigs, between the Revolution of 1789 and the re-establishment of order in France under the Consulate of Napoleon Bonaparte, openly and secretly sympathized with the anarchists, Gilray pursued and exposed them with untiring and relentless satire.

He did not spare even Burke, after he had separated from Fox on that very question. During a debate in the Commons, in January, 1792, on the Alien Bill, Burke declared that three thousand daggers had been bespoken from a Birmingham manufacturer, of which seventy had been delivered; and it had not been ascertained how many of these were to be exported, and how many were intended for home consumption; drew out a dagger, which he had kept concealed in his coat-sleeve, threw it on the floor of the House with much theatrical vehemence, and then, pointing to the weapon, exclaimed:—"This is what you are to gain by an alliance with France; wherever these principles are introduced, then practice must follow." What was intended, perhaps previously rehearsed, to be impressive, became ludicrous, and was made almost farcical by one of the members picking up the weapon, and exclaiming, with mock sim-

* Constitutional History of England, vol. xi., p. 1234.

plicity :—"Here's the knife. I wonder where the fork can be !"

Within twenty-four hours of Burke's "oratorical acting," as it has been called, his portrait, by Gilray, was in all the printsellers' windows. It represents him in the act of flinging the dagger down, both of his hands tremulously pointing to it, his figure grotesquely drawn, and his very peculiar features most ludicrously represented. Charles Knight has given an engraving of this in his *Popular History of England*,* and says, "so characteristic a likeness of Burke was never produced as in this sketch."

Gilray's popularity is based upon the fidelity of his portraits as well as his great talent for presenting persons and incidents in ludicrous points of view. His principal works have been rescued from oblivion by republication since his death, in 1815. There was a re-issue in monthly parts, in 1824 ; another, 1830, by J. McLean, London, containing 304 sheets, with descriptions, and a third, within the last ten years, with a lively volume of letter press, by Mr. H. G. Bohn, London. Some of his best works are given in Wright's "England under the House of Hanover." Pitt, with his *nez retroussé* ; Sheridan, with his beak, fed into a bulb by vinous bibations ; Fox, with his round face, low forehead, black, beetling eyebrows, and clumsily rotund figure ; Burke, with his hanging lip and eternal spectacles ; Lord North, with his plump boyish face ; Erskine, in his robes as "Counsellor Ego ;" the Prince of Wales of that day, handsome even amid his unbounded license ; Mrs. Fitzherbert, overgrown in figure, and with a face resembling a full moon ; and, above all, the plain, frog-eyed face of George the Third, in which, now that we know him, simplicity and shrewdness seem mingled with obstinacy and insanity. There was one of Gilray's sketches representing George III. as one of the giants of Brobdignag, curiously examining Gulliver, who stands on the ample palm of his hand, which has never been surpassed. The Gulliver of the sketch is Napoleon Bonaparte, who had become formidable about that time. A companion to this was "Bonaparte, chief Baker of Europe," who is shown making gingerbread Kings ; breaking up fragments of the Continent into dough, out of which these new potentates are to be formed ; taking out of the oven some of

* Vol. vii., p. 254.

these completed, such as Naples, Spain, &c. ; thrusting in some more to be baked ; with a little row of future kings on a shelf (Fox, Sheridan, Grey, &c., recognizable among them) scarcely shaped and evidently to be finished another time.

On the death of Mr. Pitt, in January, 1806, the Whigs returned to ministerial office, and were soon known as "All the Talents," from some foolish boastings of their great ability by themselves and indiscreet friends. Gilray immediately produced what many have considered his best work. It is called "Making Decent," and represents Fox, Sheridan, and others of the new Ministry, who were known to be much impoverished by riotous and improvident living, in the act of dressing for the first levee, changing their tattered habiliments for Court suits, the whole group washing, shaving, powdering, and scrubbing. The satire was direct and personal, with strong force of truth ; the likenesses were perfect, and the laugh rang throughout England. But Gilray's career was near its close. He took the popular side, against the Duke of York, next brother of the Prince of Wales, who, in 1809, had to submit to a parliamentary inquiry, and popular indignation, on charges of having knowingly permitted Mrs. Mary Ann Clarke, his mistress, to dispose, for money, of his patronage as Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Gilray's mind gave way in 1811, and he died in 1815, in great poverty. He was a power in his time—vigorous, accurate, and sarcastic ; not often grotesque, with only occasional gaiety, but always driving the arrow home.

Thomas Rowlandson, though ranked among the caricaturists, scarcely deserves to be mustered in that corps. He was a Londoner, who had studied drawing at Paris and continued his studies in the Royal Academy, then under the presidency of Sir Joshua Reynolds. He was over seventy at his death, in 1827. He is now known only by his grotesque illustrations of the three series of "Dr. Syntax," "The Dance of Life," and "The Dance of Death." These were published, as gaudily colored engravings, and are chiefly noticeable for their bold extravagance. His men, women, and children are drawn out of nature in figure, feature, and attitude. Some of his back-grounds are tolerable, but when Rowlandson's drawings excite the risible muscles, it is not so much in mirthful admiration as in almost contemptuous ridicule. Whoever will submit to waste an hour in looking at "Dr.

Syntax," will wonder how such a miserable work—the joint production of a worn-out pencil and a feeble pen—could have been popular, in England, half a century ago:—nay, it even was reproduced, in fac-simile, in this country, and had a large sale! The system upon which this work, with others by the same authors, was manufactured, was original, at least. William Coombe, who died at an advanced age in 1823, was a man of great learning and many accomplishments, who, after running through a couple of large fortunes, became a sort of pensioner upon the late Rudolph Ackermann, an enterprising German, who, settling in London, with some taste for, and knowledge of, the Fine Arts, became head of a large establishment, at 96 Strand, for the sale of paintings, engravings, and artists' and amateurs' materials.

He it was who introduced lithography, the accidental invention of Aloys Senefelder, his countryman, into England, as early as the year 1807. He was publisher and founder of "The Forget-me-Not," which, as the first English Annual, was "father of a line of Kings;" and he issued a Ladies' Magazine, "La Belle Assemblée," to which Coombe and Rowlandson contributed with pen and pencil. It was in this that "Dr. Syntax in Search of the Picturesque," a rambling, desultory story in octosyllabic verse, first appeared as a serial. Rowlandson having designed and etched a comic exaggeration, a proof would be sent to Coombe, who was always to be found "at home," for he was, in his closing years, under perpetual arrest for debt, and lived within "the Rules" of the King's Bench Prison—said rules extending a considerable space around that doleful mansion. Within forty-eight hours after Coombe had received Rowlandson's design, the rhymed letter press to illustrate it would be in the printers' hands, and this would be repeated for months, until, the subject getting exhausted, artist and rhymester would wind up. Rarely, if ever, did Coombe know what scene he would have to write up to, until he had Rowlandson's handiwork for the next month placed in his hands. In this manner "Dr. Syntax" was made, and, from its popularity, two other series were produced—one representing Syntax in search of Consolation, the other showing him in search of a Wife. After Coombe had killed off this clerical hero, in the last volume, so much regret was expressed at his loss, that Coombe wrote "The History of Johnny Quæ Genus" (a foundling of the late Syntax), and Rowlandson, as before, supplied

the plates. Yet this doggerel and this burlesque upon humorous art were popular and profitable, at the very time when Scott, Moore, Campbell, Southey, Wordsworth, and Byron, were enjoying the fulness of fame in England.

Thomas Rowlandson, with his vulgar burlesque and buffoonery, is not worthy of being named on the same day with George Cruikshank. The difference between them is like that between low farce and pure comedy. Not groundlessly did Christopher North say, in the immortal Noctes, George Cruikshank is far more than the prince of caricaturists; a man who regards the outgoings of life with the eye of genius; and he has a clear insight through the exterior of manners into the passions of the heart. He has wit as well as humour—feeling as well as fancy—and his original vein appears to be inexhaustible. It is as difficult, sometimes, to ascertain the age of an artist as it proverbially is to fix that of a—woman. That of Cruikshank has usually been set down rather loosely, as “he was born about the year 1796.” If so, he must have been an illustrator of Magazines at the precocious age of twelve, for we have on our table a copy of *The Scourge* (a scurrilous London magazine, of which more anon), published in 1808, a large engraving, etched by himself on copper, bold and free in the drawing, and very much in Gilray’s broadest manner. The subject is the Prince of Wales; and with a freedom that would not be tolerated now, he introduced no less a personage than Lady Yarmouth, afterwards Marchioness of Hertford, the favourite sultana at that time, who gets many sharp hits in Moore’s earlier satirical poems, particularly “The Twopenny Postbag.” The obese figure of the Prince (afterwards Byron’s “Leviathan of Royalty,” as George the Fourth), and his enormous whiskers, elaborate fictions, were literally hit off “to a hair” in this early caricature.

In that useful hand-book, “Men of the Time,” for 1867, Cruikshank is set down as having been born in London on September 27, 1792. This makes him now in his seventy-sixth year, and the veteran, notwithstanding his age, is the active colonel of a volunteer corps in London. His father, a clever water-colour draughtsman, who sometimes drew tolerable caricatures, put a pencil into his hands at an unusually early age, perceiving that he had a strong natural talent for drawing. He lost his father while yet a child, and was brought up by his elder brother, the late Robert Isaac Cruikshank, whose inferior productions

have sometimes been mistaken for *his*. Even while yet a schoolboy, George Cruikshank was employed to illustrate popular songs and children's books. His ambition led him to study in the Royal Academy, and he was admitted by Mr. Fuseli, Professor of Painting in that institution from 1799 to 1804, but received so little encouragement that he attended only once as a student, though he became an exhibitor at a much later date. He was the regular illustrator, from about 1806 until they perished from want of subscribers, of two monthlies, *The Scourge* and *The Meteor*, edited with abundant scurrility, and chiefly relying on the clever caricatures supplied by Cruikshank. After these magazines were discontinued, Cruikshank lived "from hand to mouth," for some years, principally by making political caricatures for publishers, without caring which party he raised the laugh against. One of these, certainly equal to any thing ever done by Gilray, appeared in 1815, after the Restoration of the Bourbons, and represented Louis XVIII. trying to pull on Bonaparte's boots,—a sharp hit at a brief attempt to govern the monarchy by the measures which had created the Empire.

At last came the accession of George the Fourth, followed by the persecution and prosecution of Caroline of Brunswick, the thoughtless and imprudent wife whom he had deserted even in their honeymoon, twenty-five years before. William Hone, who, in December, had narrowly escaped conviction in three distinct trials on charges of blasphemy, for having published parodies on parts of the Book of Common Prayer, had manfully defended himself, and, being acquitted, proved that every man who is his own lawyer does *not*, necessarily, have "a fool for his client." His Report of these three trials ran through nineteen editions in the next twelve months, and to the money thus gained was added a large sum raised by subscription among the ultra-liberals of that day, usually called Radicals, because they contended for "Radical Reform in Church and State." Hone, who had repeatedly failed in business as a bookseller (he never succeeded in any undertaking, except book-making, and even that brought him more fame than profit), went into the business again, and, taking advantage of the popular *furor* in favour of Queen Caroline, published a number of political and social satires in favour of her Majesty and against the King and his Ministers, the designs of which were supplied by Cruikshank, who took to his work with great spirit and

success. His name was well known among "the trade," for the London publishers of caricatures,—chiefly Humphrey of St. James's Street, Sidebotham of the Strand, Johnson of Cheapside, and Fores of Piccadilly,—had been almost exclusively supplied by him for some years. Among the most popular of the Cruikshank-Hone political satires were "The House that Jack Built," "The Political Showman at Home," "The Man in the Moon," "Poor Mr. Brendo," and "The Queen's Matrimonial Ladder,"—one hundred thousand copies of each of these being sold. Cruikshank rose with the occasion, and showed himself a great artist. The letter-press of these *brochures* was mostly written by Hone, whose "Every-Day Book" and "Table Book" now belong to the standard literature of England, and usually consisted of rattling-rhymes, easily retained in the memory. The greatest production of this class, however, was a "Slap at Slop," representing a newspaper, the size of the then broad sheet of *The Times*, in which Dr., afterwards Sir John, Stoddard, then editing "The Thunderer," was soundly ridiculed and berated, in company with the Prince Regent, Southey, the Constitutional Association, George Canning, Lords Sidmouth, Eldon, and Liverpool, and, more especially, the duke of Wellington and Lord Castlereagh, the last nicknamed "Derrydown Triangle," to indicate at once his birthplace and the cruel whippings which he permitted, if he did not order, to be inflicted upon merely suspected persons in Ireland during the Rebellion of Ninety-eight. The whole was a parody upon a daily newspaper of the time; advertisements, articles of intelligence, leading articles, police reports, reviews of books, poetry, and miscellaneous paragraphs being cleverly burlesqued, with numerous illustrations, from Cruikshank's drawings interspersed through the whole. Even the parody of the Government red stamp was a political caricature in miniature. The *Slap at Slop* preceded the amusing publications which raised the public laugh against the Queen's opponents, had an enormous sale, at one shilling per copy. It has become so rare that George Cruikshank himself did not own a copy of it in 1850. Perhaps the only copy in the United States is that in our own possession. The Queen's death, in August, 1821, took away a profitable subject from Cruikshank, but there remained considerable fierceness and personality in British politics. Cruikshank, a liberal in grain, worked admirably for whoever paid him, at that

time, and hence his caricatures of Brougham, Grey, Mackintosh, Joseph Hume, Peter Moore, little Waddington, Sir Francis Burdett, Grey Bennet, and William Cobbett, were as amusing as those of their Tory rivals had previously been. But the hour of his deliverance from thus making bricks without straw was at hand.

There was a certain Pierce Egan in London half a century ago, who, being editor of a sporting paper, and the annalist of the prize-ring, had compiled several volumes, with portraits of noted pugilists, which he entitled "Boxiana." It had pleased Professor John Wilson, who was what Charles Kingsley calls "a muscular Christian," to write several articles in *Blackwood's Magazine*, highly eulogistic of these records of the Fancy, as well as of *Sporting Anecdotes* by the same author. These contributed to make Egan popular, and to him, therefore, Cruikshank applied to write a book illustrative of the mischievous, if pleasant, practices of seeing what was called "life" in the Modern Babylon. His original idea was to tell a story in a series of pictures,—*without* accompanying letter-press, if possible, which he accomplished in "The Bottle" five-and-twenty years later. Egan professed to enter into the artist's spirit, and began a serial tale, entitled "Life in London," which, as it proceeded, ran so entirely counter to the artist's purpose that he abandoned it in disgust, his brother Robert undertaking to finish the plates. This work, which was far more popular than even "Dr. Syntax" had been, was still more successful when dramatized, under the name of "Tom and Jerry." It is the nature of some authors to run a good idea into the earth. Therefore "Life in Paris" followed "Life in London," and there was a "Life in Ireland," redolent of *poteen* and resonant with the clangour of hostile shillalahs, which closed the series. But, though the *other* Cruikshank perpetrated the designs for these, George, who originated the plan, got the credit, which was not much. It made him better known, however, as a great deal more than a caricaturist. Publishers began to see that he was a winning card in their hands.

His first independent publication was "Points of Honour," the opening number of which appeared early in 1823, with a dozen etchings and fifty pages of well-written letter-press. *Blackwood's Magazine*, for July, 1823, gave an article of eight pages, praising this work, and thereby helped to establish its author's reputation. Henceforth,

he had as much employment as he could undertake, in illustrating books. Sometimes he etched his designs on copper, but generally drew them on wood for the engraver. He must have received a total of heavy payments from 1823 to 1868. Among the works which he illustrated literally with thousands of original designs, are Grimm's German Stories, Mornings in Bond-street, Tales of Irish Life, Hans of Iceland, the Epping Hunt, John Gilpin, Three Courses and a Dessert, Punch and Judy, the British Novelists, the Waverley Novels, numerous biographies, histories, and travels; poems and stories; many magazines; a number of Ainsworth's romances; Greenwich Hospital; Dickens's Sunday in London, Life of Grimaldi, Sketches by Boz, and Oliver Twist. His own publications proper, besides the Points of Humour, are Illustrations of Time, Illustrations of Phrenology, My Sketch-Book, Cruikshank's Omnibus (in conjunction with the late Laman Blanchard), and The Table Book. He also published Cruikshank's Comic Almanac, illustrated by himself, and the letter-press by the best writers of light literature, which appeared long before *Punch* was established, and flourished for some years after. In the last thirty years, Cruikshank has been the advocate, by precept, practice, and pencil, of the Temperance question. Latterly, he has painted a good deal in oils, successfully shown in the Royal Academy Exhibition, but his latest and largest oil-painting, which he took down to Windsor Castle in 1863, at the request of Queen Victoria, is "The Worship of Bacchus," from which an engraving has been made. Mr. Cruikshank is an effective public speaker, and was one of the best amateur performers in Charles Dickens's dramatic entertainments for the benefit of the Guild of Literature and Art. He has a small pension from the Crown. It is singular that, with his great powers as a pictorial satirist, George Cruikshank has not contributed to *Punch*. In his own Omnibus and Table Book are several satirical illustrations far superior in merit to most of those in the professedly comic periodicals.

There is now on the press, in London, a "Caricature History of the Georges; or, Annals of the House of Hanover: compiled from the Squibs, Broad-sides, Window-Pictures, Lampoons, and Pictorial Caricatures of the Time;" from the pen of Mr. Thomas Wright, the translator into English of the Emperor Napoleon's "Vie de Jules César," and editor of the collection of Gilray's

caricatures, mentioned in the text, and author of the *History of Caricature*. It will contain nearly four hundred illustrations from the caricatures of Gilray, Bunbury, Rowlandson, and other masters of pictorial satire.

The last professional caricaturist in England was Mr. John Doyle, who had learned to draw horses in Ireland, of which he was a native, but, soon after he settled in London, discovered that he could draw their riders at least as well. From 1830 to 1850, his caricatures, known as "Sketches by H. B.," were almost "alone in their glory,"—their peculiar merit being that in them were united strength and grace, and that, however ridiculous he sometimes made his personages appear, he never made them vulgar. He seized upon public men and public things, and his satire was gentle rather than incisive. He was happy in always making admirable likenesses, rarely running into exaggeration. Of course, he did not take pains to soften down the exuberance of Brougham's nose; to mitigate the palpable Hibernianism of O'Connell's good-natured face; to subdue the plausible expression of Peel's countenance; to make Lord Morpeth look less like John Liston, the actor; to throw intelligence into the face of King William, or humanity into that of his brother of Cumberland; to make Wellington's outline less rigid, or diminish the hauteur of Lord Grey, or add a cubit to the diminutive stature of Lord John Russell, or thin the flowing curls of Lord Ellenborough. His portraits were liked, were laughed at, but were never vulgar. It was truly said of him that "he was an innately refined artist." Some of his portraits were far above caricature—for example, those of Charles Butler and Sir William Follett, both of whom prematurely passed away from public life, just when their great talents had been recognized. Butler, had he lived, would probably have occupied the place in political life now held by Mr. Gladstone, and Sir William Follett was recognized as the inevitable and indispensable Lord Chancellor whenever the Tories returned to office. The H. B. likenesses of these eminent men were highly artistical, and better than any of the more elaborate portraits executed by professional limners. Mr. Doyle's drawing was frequently incorrect, but he never failed to produce a pleasing sketch. Many of his subjects were suggested to him by newspaper comments on public personages and events, and the rapidity with which he worked added to his popularity. He drew his sketch on

the stone, and it was lithographed with the least possible delay. A leader in the *Times* or the *Morning Chronicle* gave the idea, and within forty-eight hours an H. B. sketch had embodied it. Before the shop-window of Mr. Thomas McLean, in the Haymarket, when a new H. B. was exhibited, a crowd of amused persons would stand, enjoying the wit which it embodied. His satire was very gentle—if satire could be genial, his was. For years he amused the town, until *Punch* hurled him from the throne, his own son Richard being one of *Punch's* artists, and having produced over a thousand sketches. They were largely popular, not in England alone, but in foreign countries, and found their way, with due regularity, to enliven even the privacy of monarchs. They were pictorial readings, in fact, of political and social life in England for twenty years. Entire sets, which are still in request so largely in Australia, which has supported a clever *Punch* of its own for several years, and command great prices in the market. Mr. Doyle, who died in January, 1868, was a very undemonstrative, though unmis-takeably an Irish gentleman, courteous in manner, much opposed to gossip and *scan. mag.*, taking a kindly view of human nature, and, it is recorded to his credit, “never making use of material gathered in private to wing his pencil.” He was fortunate in his domestic relations, and his children, most of whom are artists, have won success, like himself, in an honourable manner.

Any sketch, however rapid, of English pictorial satire, would be imperfect if it neglected to mention a remarkable series of illustrations, with racy letter-press, which were very attractive for several years in *Fraser's Magazine*. It was entitled “The Gallery of Illustrious Literary Characters,” now generally named as “The Fraserscan Portraits.” About the year 1829, the connexion of the late Dr. William Maginn with *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* was suspended for a time. Maginn had quitted his native city of Cork, having established himself in London as associate editor of *The Standard*, then, as now, a powerful Tory afternoon journal, had latterly contributed less to and drawn more money from *Blackwood* than its proprietor approved of, and the result was that Maginn ceased to contribute for some years, with the resolution of establishing a London magazine, to be chiefly under his own control. At that time he was in his thirty-fifth year, learned, able, ready, full of talent, and with an established reputation as the

renowned Sir Morgan O'Dogherty of Maga. He soon was enabled to gratify his ambition, and the first number of *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* appeared in February, 1830, and certainly was much unlike the *Gentleman's*, with its heavy antiquarian articles—the *London*, prematurely worn out—the *Monthly*, always dull—the *New Monthly*, which had little vitality during Campbell's dozing and almost nominal editorship, and the *Imperial*, which circulated chiefly among the religious community. There was room, just then, for a new and dashing magazine in London, and no one could complain of the want of spirit, talent, and variety in *Fraser*. Maginn was its head, with a proprietor and a publisher, who had money and business habits, which *he* never possessed. Maginn gathered around him a number of eminent and available contributors. In the first volume he had articles, in prose or verse, from Southey, Lockhart, Hogg, Basil Hall, Allan Cunningham, John Galt, Crofton Croker, T. Haynes Bayly, "Barry Cornwall," John Kenyon, Moir (the "Delta" of *Blackwood*), Miss Jewsbury, "The Harrovian," J. A. Horand, L. E. L., and S. T. Coleridge. The magazine, saucy, clever, and full of life, was strong from the first, but its great and decided hit was made in the fifth number, when appeared the portrait of William Jerdan, editor of the *Literary Gazette*, then a ruling power in the English world of letters.

This was a full-length sketch, showing Jerdan, who was very well known, sitting in his study reading a manuscript, and was scarcely a caricature. Facing it, was a page of bantering letter-press, which pretended to be a biography. The last portrait of the series appeared seven years later than the first, each with a single racy page of pleasantry and satire, almost invariably written by Maginn. Dr. Macnish, author of "The Philosophy of Drunkenness," who met Maginn in London, during the palmy days of *Fraser*, wrote to a friend in Scotland:—"The letter-press of the Gallery of Literary Portraits he hit off at a moment's notice, and in the course of a few minutes." They were among his most racy productions. Lockhart wrote the lively remarks on Maginn's own portrait, Carlyle did the same for that of Goethe, and the Ettrick Shepherd supplied the notice of Sir David Brewster—his most racy production.

There were eighty-one plates in the Fraserian gallery, containing portraits of eight female and seventy male

authors or publicists. There also were groups of the Fraserians, the Antiquarians, and Regina's Maids of Honour. The sum total was one hundred and two portraits, chiefly of living celebrities, at least half of whom had contributed to *Fraser*. Sometimes the likenesses were dashed with caricature. That of Rogers, who looked more like a ghost than a living man during the thirty years of his existence, was said to have been "done to the death." Miss Martineau was drawn as an old maid, cooking a posset in a saucepan by the fire, with a cat on her shoulder; but the other seven ladies were kindly dealt with, particularly L. E. L., whose pretty little face was most elaborately worked up. The peculiar head and figure of Scott were admirably represented, and the portraits of Theodore Hook, Thomas Carlyle, Sir David Brewster, Leigh Hunt, Grant Thorburn, Beranger, Jane Porter, Lady Morgan, Cobbett, Mrs. Norton, Delta, Faraday, Fraser, and Maginn himself, are very good. The Rev. Sydney Smith was the last of the series, and his good-humoured face and clumsily pinguish figure were recognizable by every one who had once seen him. The likeness of Robert Montgomery was keenly satirical, but his vanity deserved a reproof. On the whole, there was very little bad feeling observable in these portraits, which, for about eight years, were a great point of attraction in *Fraser*. Seven foreigners were introduced, of whom Washington Irving was the only American.

As general readers may not be able to refer to the first seventeen volumes of *Fraser* containing these portraits, we shall gratify them by giving a list, in the order in which they appeared:—William Jerdan, editor of the *Literary Gazette*; Thomas Campbell, editor of the *New Monthly*; John Gibson Lockhart, editor of the *Quarterly*; Samuel Rogers, author of the "Pleasures of Hope;" Thomas Moore, author of "Lalla Rookh;" Walter Scott, author of "Waverley;" John Galt, author of a "Life of Byron;" William Maginn, "The Doctor;" T. Crofton Croker, author of "The Irish Fairy Legends;" Caroline Norton, author of "The Undying One;" John Wilson, editor of *Blackwood's Magazine*; Miss Mitford, author of "Our Village;" Don Telesforo de Trueba y Cosio, author of a comedy called "The Exquisites;" the Earl of Munster, author of a "Journey from India to England;" Lord John Russell, author of "Memoirs of the Affairs of Europe;" John Wilson Croker, editor of "Boswell's Johnson;" Tydus-pooh-pooh, Our Man of Genius,

translator of the "Poetry of the Sandwich Islands" (intended to ridicule Sir John Bowring); Washington Irving, author of the "Sketch-Book;" Lord Brougham and Vaux, editor of "The Times" (which he was *not*); Robert Montgomery, author of "Satan;" Prince de Talleyrand, author of "Palmerston, une Comédie de Deux Ans;" James Morier, author of "Hadji Baba in England;" Countess of Blessington, author of "Conversations with Lord Byron;" The Tiger (Dr. William Dunlop), author of "Sketches of Upper Canada;" Benjamin Disraeli, author of "Vivian Gray;" Thomas Carlyle, translator of "Wilhelm Meister;" Edward Lytton Bulwer (Lord Lytton), author of "The Siamese Twins;" Allan Cunningham, author of "Lives of the British Painters;" William Wordsworth, author of "The Excursion;" Sir David Brewster, author of the "Life of Newton;" William Roscoe, author of the "Life of Lorenzo de Medici;" James Hogg, author of "The Chaldee Manuscript;" the Baron von Goethe, author of "Faust;" Isaac Disraeli, author of "Life and Character of Charles I.;" a few of the F. S. A.'s, viz., Lord Aberdeen, Jordan, Crofton Croker, Disraeli, sen., John Bowyer Nichols, Sir Henry Ellis, Sir Nicholas Carlisle, Robert Lemon, of the Record Office, William H. Henry Rosser, John Frost, Alfred John Kempe, William Brooke, the artist, John Caley, Henry Hallam, William R. Hamilton, Davis Gilbert, members, and Mr. Martin, clerk, of the Society of Antiquaries; Louis Eustache Ude, author of "The French Cook;" Rev. Dr. Dionysius Lardner, editor of the "Cabinet Cyclopædia;" Samuel Taylor Coleridge, author of "Christabel;" George Cruikshank, author of "Illustrations of Time;" Dr. David M. Moir (Delta), author of "The Life of Mansie Wauch;" Miss L. E. Landon, author of "Romance and Reality;" Miss Harriet Martineau, author of "Illustrations of Political Economy;" Grant Thorburn, the *Original* "Lawrie Todd;" Sir John Ross, author of "Voyage to Baffin's Bay;" Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges, author of "Mary de Clifford;" Daniel O'Connell and Richard Lalor Shiel (on one plate); Theodore Hook, author of "Sayings and Doings;" Charles Molloy Westmacott, editor of "*The Age*;" Leigh Hunt, author of "Byron and his Contemporaries;" The Fraserians, a group assembled in January, 1835, after dinner, Dr. Maginn in the chair, and Mr. James Fraser as "croupier," consisting of the following twenty-five contributors:—Barry Cornwall (Proctor), Robert Southey,

Percival W. Banks, W. M. MacKeray, John Churchill, Sergeant Murphy, Robert Macnish, W. H. Ainsworth, S. T. Coleridge, James Hogg, John Galt, William Dunlop, William Jerdan, Crofton Croker, J. G. Lockhart, Theodore Hook, Sir David Brewster, Dr. Moir, Thomas Carlyle, Count D'Orsay, Allan Cunningham, Sir Egerton Brydges, Rev. G. R. Gleig, Rev. Francis Mahony ("Father Prout"), Rev. Edward Irving. This plate was reproduced, in 1860, as frontispiece to a new edition of the "Reliques of Father Prout." Charles Lamb, author of "Elia;" Pierre-Jean de Beranger, author of "Les Souvenirs du Peuple;" Jane Porter, author of "Thaddeus of Warsaw;" Lady Morgan, author of "O'Donnel;" Alaric A. Watts, editor of the "Literary Souvenir;" William Harrison Ainsworth, author of "Rookwood;" Thomas Hill, author of "The Mirror of Fashion;" Rev. G. R. Gleig, author of "The Subaltern;" William Godwin, author of "Caleb Williams;" James Smith, one of the authors of "Rejected Addresses;" Comte D'Orsay, author of "A Journal;" Lord Francis Egerton (Earl of Ellesmere), translator of Goethe's "Faust;" Henry O'Brien, author of "The Round Towers of Ireland;" Michael Thomas Sadler, author of "The Law of Population;" William Cobbett, author of "The Political Register;" Earl of Mulgrave, author of "Yes and No;" Robert Macknish, author of "The Anatomy of Drunkenness;" Regina's Maids of Honour—a ladies' tea-party, consisting of Mrs. S. C. Hall, L. E. Landon, Lady Morgan, Hon. Mrs. Norton, Lady Blessington, Jane Porter, Harriet Martineau, and Miss Mitford; Michael Faraday, author of "Chemical Manipulations;" Rev. W. L. Bowles, author of "Fourteen Sonnets, 1786;" Francis Place, author of "Principles of Population;" Sir John C. Hobhouse (Lord Broughton), author of "The Miscellany;" Mrs. S. C. Hall, author of "The Buccaneer;" Mr. Sergeant Talfourd, author of "Ion;" Sir John Seare, author of "Designs of Buildings;" Lord Lyndhurst, author of "Summary of the Session" (annual speech at close of Parliamentary Session); Edward Ledge, author of "Memoirs of Illustrious Personages;" J. B. Buckstone, author of "Victorine;" this appeared in December, 1836, and no other portraits were given until March and April, 1838, when the series wound up with Sir William Molesworth, editor of the *London and Westminster Review*, and (perhaps the best of the whole, much in Gilray's own style) the Rev. Sydney Smith,

author of "Peter Plymley's Letters on the Catholics."

So closed a series which pen and pencil united to make the best that ever appeared. It is unique and rare—the more so because, owing to the expense of lithographing so many plates, it is not likely ever to be republished. The writer of this possesses a complete set, with other engraved portrait-views, printed biographies, autograph letters, obituary notices from *The Times* and other Journals, and numerous other illustrative clippings. On looking through them, whilst writing this article, we see how busily Death has been employed in thinning their ranks. Out of one hundred and two persons portrayed in the Fraserian Gallery in 1830-'38, only eighteen survive. These are Ainsworth, the novelist; Buckstone, the author-actor; Bulwer, now Lord Lytton; Thomas Carlyle; George Cruikshank; Benjamin Disraeli; Sir John Bowring; Rev. G. R. Gleig; Sir J. C. Hobhouse, now Lord Broughton; William Jordan; Lord John Russell; Mrs. S. C. Hall; Miss Martineau; Hon. Mrs. Norton; Barry Cornwall; Sir Henry Ellis; and Messrs. Kempe and Rosser. Within the present year, Sir David Brewster, Mr. Faraday, and Lord Brougham have departed.

Much curiosity was excited, while these Fraserian portraits were being published, as to their authorship. A few of them were marked *A. Croquis*, which was supposed, for a long time, to be identical with *Alfred Crowquill*, a pseudonyme assumed by Mr. Alfred Henry Forrester, professional author and amateur artist, who, while a public notary in the Royal Exchange of London, a lucrative office which had been held by members of his family for over one hundred and fifty years, began his literary career by publishing a volume of comic prose and verse ("Leaves from my Memorandum Book"), with illustrations of his own. This, and a volume of "Eccentric Tales," appeared in 1826, and during the next two years he produced several clever caricatures, ridiculing the exaggerated fashions of feminine attire then prevalent. He wrote a great deal, during the next thirty years, in the periodical literature of the day, and, indeed, though now past the age of sixty, his pen and pencil are not allowed to rest. He has exhibited clever pen-and-ink drawings in the Royal Academy, has painted in oils; he also engraves and models. He was one of the first artists employed to illustrate *Punch*, and one of his works is "A Bundle of Crowquills." The actual portrait-taker of

Fraser's Magazine was Daniel Maclise, R. A., the eminent historical painter, whom Dr. Maginn had known as a promising lad in Cork, and with whom he became very intimate when, two years before *Fraser* was commenced, the youth, then only seventeen years old, settled in London, with the purpose of making painting his profession.

Maclise, who was born in Cork, in January, 1811, is now among the most distinguished British artists, and his latest historical works, in the new Palace of Westminster—"The Death of Nelson" and "The Meeting of Wellington and Blucher after Waterloo"—place him without a superior. Among his most valued productions are a few portraits, full of truth and character, and his facility in catching a likeness is so great that, in his early days in Ireland, being present at a masquerade got up for a charitable purpose, he personated an itinerant artist, rapidly making grotesque sketches of the persons present, which were sold on the spot for the benefit of the charity. This, with a faculty of remembering and a power of drawing faces which he met in society, well qualified him for what he did for *Fraser's Magazine*, to which he also was a poetical contributor. The French word *Croquis* (a sketch) was affixed as a signature to denote the slight manner of his pencillings. In January, 1840, after the "Gallery of Illustrious Literary Characters" had been closed, *Fraser* opened with a long article recapitulating what the magazine had done in its first ten years, and the credit of producing the portraits was given to Maclise. In every biographical notice of him, this is boldly stated, and, if this were not sufficient to establish the fact, we have Mr. Maclise's own acknowledgment of it.

Having enumerated the leading British caricatures, previous to those fostered, almost created, by *Punch*, it may not be uninteresting to mention some preceding periodicals in which the writer called in the aid of the artist to sharpen his barbs. *The Scourge*, which George Cruikshank illustrated in his youth, with a highly-coloured large caricature, was coarse in politics, morals, satire, and authorship. It is extremely scarce, but its seven volumes, coming down to the Regency (January, 1811), are to be seen in the British Museum. It was violent in abuse of public men, and was eternally in hot water. There is little reason to question the statement that its publication was terminated, as old Trapbois would say, "for a consideration"—the Prince Regent thinking it worth while to purchase editor and publisher.

Figaro in London, the first number of which appeared in 1830, as a weekly publication, struggled on through eight years, under a succession of editors and publishers. Its title-head included a wood-cut of a barber dressing the Whigs, and it was said that the operator was intended to represent Mr. Sugden (now Ex-Chancellor Lord St. Leonards), who, as a bitter Tory, was personally obnoxious to the Whigs, then in office. He was a barber's son, who had risen by talent and labor to a leading station at the bar, and surely it was bad taste, in a publication intended by its low price and popular character, to reach the masses, to sneer at humble birth. Its first and ablest editor was Gilbert Abbott A'Beckett, son of a London attorney, well educated, with an innate tendency to satire and humour, very liberal political feelings, and a decided taste for theatrical performances and actors' society. When he began his work as editor, he was little more than twenty years old. He took the Paris *Figaro* for his model, and produced a sharp, clever, amusing little paper, in which parliamentary reform was fiercely advocated and the gossip of the town and the theatres pleasantly retailed. *Figaro* could scarcely be called vulgar. Its main points were adopted by *Punch*, with which Mr. A'Beckett became connected for many years. He was called to the bar in 1841, and after serving as assistant poor law commissioner, became a writer on *The Times*. Through the friendship of the late Mr. Charles Buller, he was made one of the London police-magistrates, bringing good feeling and sound common-sense into the performance of his duties. His connexion with *Punch* continued until his death, in 1856. He wrote numerous successful plays, but his literary reputation rests upon his "Comic Blackstone" (in *Punch*), and his comic histories of Rome and England, illustrated by John Leech.

The success of *Figaro* challenged competition, and *Punchinello* appeared in 1832. It was a penny weekly, of four pages, to which Robert and George Cruikshank contributed the wood-cuts. Next arose *Asmodeus; or, The Devil in London*, illustrated by Robert Seymour, the gifted but unfortunate first illustrator of "Pickwick," who committed suicide before he could make the drawings for Mr. Dickens' second number. *Asmodeus*, lived for nine months, and failed from want of proper business management. The collected numbers, under the title of "The Devil's Memorandum-Book," were repub-

lished in 1833. *Dibdin's Penny Trumpet* was blown for four weeks, in 1832, and *The Schoolmaster at Home*, which abused the leading Tories and Queen Adelaide in every number, was almost as short lived. *Figaro*, which increased the number and improved the character of its wood-cuts, outlived numerous rivals which imitated its appearance and arrangement, without exhibiting its talent. *The Town* was established by Renton Nicholson, who obtained a doubtful reputation as founder of the legal burlesque, so popular in London twenty years ago, known as the Judge and Jury Society. Nicholson, a man of considerable ability and moderate education, began life as a pawnbroker's clerk, and was successively a billiard-marker, a "bonnet" in a gambling house, landlord of the Garrick's Head theatrical tavern, and, finally, a pauper. *The Town*, though obscene and profane, was well written, well illustrated, and well managed. It had a very large circulation, for three years, dying in 1841. Contemporary with it were several short-lived weeklies, of which *The Wag* was the least offensive. There was also *The Thief*, which was true to its title, for the letter-press was all stolen, and the wood-cuts were old customers. *Clare's Gazette of Variety* and *The Oddfellow*, which appeared about this time, were illustrated with original designs by Henry Meadows, William Harvey, and Robert Seymour, and had the merit, at least, of being decent.*

By this time, the success of the French comic and satirical illustrated journals being notorious, certain young writers in London—of whom it may be said, not offensively, but to distinguish their grade, that they belonged to the class of Bohemians—agreed to establish a satirical comic weekly paper, on the plan of *Figaro*. They had been in the habit of meeting, for social purposes, at a small tavern in Wych Street, Covent Garden, of which Mr. Mark Lemon was landlord. Better educated than most of the class to which he thus and then belonged, and only thirty-two years old, Mr. Lemon was very popular with his customers, one of whom was Mr. Henry Mayhew, also well educated, whose father was a solicitor, in good practice in London, and whose three brothers have since distinguished themselves in various

* We are indebted for some of the statements here, respecting *Punch's* predecessors, to an article on Comic Literature, in *The Bookseller*, a London literary journal, for August, 1867. It is not always quite correct in its dates, but we have found it very suggestive.

departments of literature. Mr. Mayhew, who was three years younger than Mr. Lemon, had begun his literary career by bringing out, in conjunction with Mr. Gilbert à Beckett, the farce of the "Wandering Minstrel," at the Queen's Theatre, London, and Mr. Mark Lemon had already been successful with three or four of the sixty dramatic pieces whose paternity he acknowledges, and had occasionally written for newspapers. It is admitted that Henry Mayhew suggested the establishment of *Punch*. There was, just then, much political excitement in England. The administration of Lord Melbourne, which had succeeded that of Earl Grey, had gradually lost favour, not only in the reformed House of Commons but in public estimation; had been compelled to resign office in 1839, when outvoted on a question connected with the government of Jamaica; had crept back into place, without resuming power, on Sir Robert Peel's declining to form a cabinet unless the wives and daughters of his political opponents were removed from certain confidential posts near the person of the queen; had remained in office solely by the tolerance of Peel, who virtually controlled the votes of the House of Commons; had been repeatedly outvoted in 1840; had "appealed to the country" by a general election; and finally, when the first number of *Punch* appeared, on July 17th, 1841, the new Parliament was on the eve of assembling, with every prospect of Sir Robert Peel and his political adherents driving Lord Melbourne's cabinet into retirement—an event which took place within six weeks.

There has been little change in twenty-seven years in the general appearance and arrangement of *Punch*. The original title-page contained a rough wood-cut, representing a peripatetic theatre, in which the serio-comic history of Punch and Judy is represented, almost every fine day in the year, in the streets of London, for the hereditary gratification of the men, women, and children of that overgrown city. Ere long, when young Richard Doyle came in as one of the artists, he designed that striking title-page, or cover, in which the dog, Toby, with a frill round his neck, a feather in his cap, and a countenance grave in its aspect as that of Lord Thurlow, sits at ease upon a pile formed of volumes of *Punch*, and the facetious hunchback, pen in hand before his desk, puts one of his digitals to his nose, in a confidential manner, with a leer to match, which informs the happy reader that he has just got a facetious idea, to be put down in black and

white ere he is twenty seconds older. *Punch* has "or the London Charivari" for its second title. As Mr. à Beckett had used up the word *Figaro*, Messrs. Mayhew and Lemon were compelled to take the name of *Charicari*, the publication which M. Philipon had given to that formidable rival of *Figaro*, which he had founded in 1832. The title had been borrowed by Mr. Hughes, of *The Times*' staff, for a monthly publication, published a few months in 1840, conducted by himself and entitled, *The London Magazine, Charicari, and Courier des Dames*—a work to be remembered now only as the medium through which John Leech, the artist, first came before the public; he illustrated a serial, in that short-lived work, called "Adventures of Jacob Diddledoft." Even the principal title of *Punch* was not original. In the biography of Douglas Jerrold, by his son, it is mentioned that "On the 14th January, 1832, '*Punch in London*,' price one penny, was started; and in the first number may be most legibly traced the pen that afterwards indited in the great *Punch* of the present time, 'The 2 Letters,' and 'The Story of a Feather.'" He adds that *Punch in London* lived only a few weeks, and he had not traced his father's hand in it beyond the second number.

Douglas Jerrold was in Boulogne, his son says, "writing for the stage and for the magazines, when, on the 17th of July, 1841, some literary friends of his, including Mr. Henry Mayhew, Mr. Mark Lemon, Mr. E. Landells, Mr. Sterling Coyne, Henry Grattan, and others, started a periodical entitled *Punch; or, the London Charicari*." Mr. Mayhew, he says, was the projector of this work, and as Mayhew was Douglas Jerrold's son-in-law, this ought to settle that question. Jerrold was requested to contribute, but no article of his reached London in time for number one. In the second number, occupying precisely a full page, opposite the cartoon (No. 2 of "*Punch's Pencilings*"), appeared a dialogue, entitled "*Punch and Peel*," in which are discussed the policy and expected organization of Peel's impending administration. This was Jerrold's first contribution, and during the next sixteen years (until his death, in 1857), he wrote more or less for every number of *Punch*. The cartoon which faced this was appropriate, and it is doubtful whether, in any subsequent number, there was keener pictorial satire. Love of office has always been Lord John Russell's weakness, and he exhibited it very fully in 1839-41.

Lord Melbourne, who was a sort of *poco curante* premier, was heartsick of his situation, and, having reached his grand climacteric, was anxious to abandon the turmoil of politics. Lord John Russell, like Prior's hero, "seemed loath to depart," and clung to office after repeated defeats. Mr. Archibald S. Henning's cartoon was entitled "Hercules tearing Theseus from the rock to which he had grown," and this subject (in *Punch*) was explained by a statement that "Apollodorus relates that Theseus sat so long on a rock that, at length, he grew to it, so that when Hercules tore him forcibly away, he left all the nether part of the man behind him." The modernized scene was placed in the House of Commons. Lord John Russell was represented as seated on the Treasury Bench. Behind him, with faces exhibiting great alarm, were Lord Morpeth, Joseph Hume, and other colleagues or adherents. Peel, wearing the hide of the Nemean lion and carrying an enormous club, was depicted with a grasp upon Lord John's throat, so strong, that it pulled him up from the waist, leaving his nether part adhering to the bench.

The popularity of *Punch* was assured from the first number, but the expenses of advertising (always heavy in London), of composition, printing, paper, designing, and engraving, exceeded the proprietor's means—to say nothing of the cost of letter-press. After a few weeks, Henry Mayhew abandoned the enterprise, and a small sum (one hundred pounds, it is said), was paid for copy-right, back-numbers, stereotypes, and wood engravings; Messrs Bradbury & Evans, then not long in business as printers, being the purchasers. They placed the editorship in Mark Lemon's hands, and he still retains it. Their confidence was not misplaced, for to his excellent judgment may be largely attributed the success and influence of *Punch*.

Albert Smith was early on the literary staff, to which he contributed largely, though his connexion with it did not last long. His "Physiology of the London Medical Student," and of "London Evening Parties," were very amusing. Dr. Maginn was a writer in *Punch*, but he died in August, 1842, when it was little more than a year old. To the first volume he gave some rhymed translations, or rather paraphrases, of Anacreon and Petronius. To the second volume, when his life was ebbing away, he contributed eight articles, the best of which was a rhymed review of "Hector O'Halloran," an Irish story by

his friend W. H. Maxwell : it is chiefly noticeable for the ingenuity with which rhymes for the word O'Halloran were found. Horace Mayhew wrote "Model Men and Women," and Henry continued to contribute very suggestive ideas for the artist. Thackeray came in, after Maginn's death, in the third volume, and soon became a power. His illustrations of his own articles, not artistical but ludicrous and expressive, greatly helped his popularity—but The Snobs of England, Jeames's Diary, Punch's Prize Novelties, Mr. Brown's Letters to a Young Man about Town, and the Travelling Notes of the Fat Contributor, would have been popular without the aid of the pencil. Mr. Thackeray did not write much for *Punch* after his first visit to the United States. He was better liked, by the readers of *Punch*, than Jerrold, whose political articles were vehement in their denunciation of public men and principles. But the most popular series that ever delighted the readers of *Punch* was Jerrold's "Curtain Lectures, reported by Mr. Job Caudle, from the lips of his late Wife." The heroine is said to have been drawn from life, which can well be believed ; Mr. Caudle was the most popular personage ever presented by *Punch*. As if to prove the correctness of the generally accepted belief that sequels to popular literary productions are rarely successful, a subsequent series, in one of *Punch's Almanacs*, which introduced Mr. Caudle cruelly tyrannizing over Miss Prettyman, his second wife, in hard lectures at the breakfast-table, proved an ostentatious failure. "Punch's Letter to his Son," and "Complete Letter-Writer," were very good, sardonic and sharp ; and "The Story of a Feather," is admirably told. He had begun, in *Punch*, "Miss Robinson Crusoe," and "Mrs. Bib's Baby," but they did not hit the public taste, and were suddenly stopped. Jerrold might have said, with Beau Brummell's valet, when carrying off the creased muslin cravats, "These are our failures."

Shirley Brooks was among the early writers in *Punch*, in which his "Miss Violet" may have blushed, but not unseen. Angus B. Reach, a clever Scotchman, who died of literary overwork, was on the staff of *Punch*—but, indeed, some of the best literary talent in London was tempted into its pages, now and then, by ample remuneration. "Mr. Pips, his Diary," a very amusing series, was written by Percival Leigh. Mr. Tom Taylor, the dramatist, was a contributor. Thomas Hood was an-

nounced, in the very first number, somewhat to his own surprise, but did not write for it until some months later, and then only a few short articles. In the Christmas number for the year 1843 appeared his "Song of the Shirt," which almost every one has by heart now, and "The Pauper's Christmas Carol," almost as good. His son mentions, as his only other contribution of any importance, a poem entitled "The Dream," *apropos* of the State Trials in Ireland; also, a "Drop of Gin," illustrated by Kenny Meadows, and a very few wood-cuts. During what is called the Railway Mania of 1845-6, a great number of the telling points against speculators (nicknamed *Stags*) were supplied by clever young members of the Stock Exchange. In general, however, the class called "outsiders" have contributed very little to *Punch*. Our "Artemus Ward" was one of the very few American authors allowed to write in *Punch*, but the British public thought rather slightly of his effusions there.

The first illustrator of *Punch* was Archibald Henning, who commenced the series called "Punch's Pencillings." He was assisted, in due course, by Messrs. Hine, Nicholson, E. Landells, Kenny Meadows, John Leech, and Richard Doyle. The last of these joined the *Punch* staff very early, and his social sketches were full of truth, life, and fun, without losing that natural and expressive delicacy which indicates the poetic temperament. His "Manners and Customs of ye Englishe" are positively inimitable. Ridiculing the amusing attempts of Prince Albert at amateur farming, and his absurd invention of an army pot, apparently fashioned on the model of a flower-pot, he so seriously offended Queen Victoria that she earnestly pressed her husband to countermand an order which he had given Mr. Doyle for two fresco-paintings in the pavilion in the garden of Buckingham Palace. The prince had the good sense to see that this was not exactly the way to check a satirical pencil, and did not take any steps to deprive himself of Mr. Doyle's pictures. In 1850, when the late Dr. Wiseman, created cardinal by Pope Pius IX., was sent to England as Archbishop of Westminster, it pleased *Punch* to play the intolerant and champion Lord John Russell's "No Popery" followers, by ridiculing, for some months, the religion, purpose, character, and person of the pope and the cardinal. This was very coarsely done, and Mr. Doyle, a Catholic, naturally objected to it, but without effect. Preserving his self-respect and sacri-

ficing a large income, he seceded from *Punch*, and Mr. John Tenniel, a clever historical painter, was then called in to assist Mr. John Leech. For some years, the cartoon (the principal full page illustration), has been almost exclusively drawn by Mr. Tenniel. As a book-illustrator of the highest class, Mr. Doyle has increased his reputation since he left *Punch* (he was the artist of Thackeray's "Newcomes"), and his "Continental Tour of Messrs. Brown and Robinson is so good that the proprietors and readers of *Punch* must feel, whenever they turn over its leaves, that Mr. Doyle was a great loss.

John Leech, who died in October, 1864, aged forty-seven, was only twenty-four years old, when, on August 7, 1841, a sheet of his designs, entitled "Foreign Affairs," signed *John Lecch*, and with his artist monograph of a leech in a bottle, afterwards so well known, appeared in the fourth of "Punch's Pencillings." From that day to his last, John Leech was a leading draughtsman in *Punch*. He was the best caricaturist in England, drawing the faces of public characters almost as accurately as H. B. himself, and with infinitely more spirit. It seems to us, looking over the fifty-two volumes of *Punch*, which contain so many of his sketches, that he never missed taking and making a likeness, and the result was that the originals of his caricatures were always recognized from *Punch* the moment they were seen. There was no preserving an *incognito*, once that a public character was pencilled in *Punch*. His social sketches (many of them published collectively, as "Pictures of Life and Characters from the Portfolio of Mr. Punch") show how he had elevated burlesque and caricature into the department of art. He illustrated a large number of serial publications, including Beckett's Comic Histories of Rome and England. Perhaps his most popular sketches are those which present scenes in the sporting life of Mr. Briggs, a stout London merchant (said to have been drawn from life), who affected riding, hunting, racing, fishing, deer-stalking, shooting, &c., and invariably "came to grief." An excellent rider himself, he knew every point of a horse, and not even Herring could draw that animal more accurately. The *Times* applied to him, without exaggeration, Dr. Johnson's remark on Garrick, that "his death eclipsed the gaiety of nations." Thackeray, whom he did not long survive, wrote a highly eulogistic article upon him in the *Quarterly Review*, and Sir Edwin Landseer said, "There is not one of his designs which does

not deserve framing." In July, 1862, was exhibited in the Egyptian Hall, London, a series of Mr. Leech's sketches in oil, from subjects in *Punch*. There were sixty-nine of these, and the exhibition greatly increased the artist's popularity. Somebody had contrived by a skilful mechanical process, to expand the *Punch* sketches on canvas, and, painted over in oil by Mr. Leech himself, had the effect of actual pictures. Thus each became an original work of art. Mr. Leech's position on *Punch* was supplied by several artists, of whom Mr. George du Maurier has most nearly approached his style.

There is no doubt that, during its whole reign, *Punch* has exercised a great social and political influence. For the most part, it has been rather ultra-liberal in its views, generally supporting the Whigs, and always boldly demonstrative against misrule in foreign countries. It threw much ridicule on O'Connell and other Irish leaders, and rendered party justice to Peel while in office, though it warmly praised him after he had lost place but gained power by abolishing the taxes on bread. It sided with the Southern Confederacy during the recent American struggle, and, at various times, its circulation has been prohibited for over-bold speaking against "the authorities" in most of the European kingdoms. *Punch* has had only a single prosecution against it for libel, and that a small case, in which a second-hand clothes man got a verdict; in this respect, having better fortune than the French journal *La Caricature*, which Champfleury's "Histoire de la Caricature Moderne" informs us, had fifty-four prosecutions against it in one year. *Punch* has had few quarrels. One was with Mr. James Silk Buckingham, who founded the British and Foreign Institute (the hunchback substitutes Destitute for the last word in that title), and another with Mr. George Jones, an American actor, who re-appeared in New York, some years ago, *décoré* with the title of Count Joannes. For a long time, Mr. Alfred Bunn, a well-known theatrical manager, who wrote the librettos for many of Balfe's operas (his songs "married to immortal music" were little better than mere nonsense-verses), was very much ridiculed in *Punch*, which had a laugh at "the Poet Bunn" week after week. At last, Mr. Bunn retaliated, bringing out a pictorial sheet, almost a fac-simile of *Punch* in appearance, and filled with all manner of attacks, in every variety of prose and verse, upon Lemon, A Beckett, and Jerrold, as his principal enemies, whom he described as

Thick-head, Sleek-head, and Wrong-head. He gave the personal history of each, describing Lemon in his original trade of selling gin and half-and half in the public-house over Covent Garden; reprinting the schedule of his various occupations, residences, and debts, which Mr. à Beckett had filed when getting "whitewashed" in the Court of Insolvent Debtors; and dealing with Jerrold's personal antecedents in an equally free manner. That time, at least, Bunn had the laugh on his side, and *Punch* never again named him. Mr. Boucicault, the dramatist, described *Punch* as properly characterized by the four writers who originated it: thus Gilbert à Beckett represented the spirit; Henry Mayhew the sugar; Douglas Jerrold the acid, and Mark Lemon the spoon!

In 1861, when *Punch* had completed its twentieth year and fortieth volume, its proprietor issued a reprint of the whole, at a somewhat reduced price, prefixing to each volume four pages of political and personal explanations, which were intended to facilitate the understanding, by readers of the present generation, of the subjects which had amused their parents. Of this new edition a large impression was sold.

The rivals of *Punch* have been numerous. *The Squib*, began in 1842, lived eight months; *Puck*; the *Puppet-Show* (in 1848); *The Month*, which lasted a year; *Chat*, in 1850-51; *Diogenes*, one of the best of the imitators, edited by Robert Kemp Philip, and chiefly illustrated by Mr. Watts Phillips, now a dramatist, then a draughtsman and engraver on wood; a second *Punchinello*, which lasted half a year; *Town Talk*; and *London*, a comic weekly, edited by G. A. Sala, seventeen years ago, but a failure. *Mephistophiles* and *The British Lion* appeared in 1859, but, though both were undoubtedly clever, success was not their destiny. In 1863, *Fun* appeared, and is now decidedly established, after much opposition and many changes. Mr. Thomas Hood, only son of him "who sang the Song of the Shirt," has edited the second series since its commencement, with considerable liveliness. He affects the familiar signature of "Tom Hood," which belonged solely to his father. His principal literary assistants have been "Arthur Sketchley," Mr. Burnaud, H. J. Byron, the dramatist. The artists who, more than the authors, made the reputation of *Fun*, were William Brunton; Paul Gray, a young Irishman who was rapidly approaching the excellence of Mr. Leech; W. McConnell, and Charles Bennett. Of these, the three last

have died—Mr. Bennett only a short time ago, on the staff of *Punch*.

In 1847, after Albert Smith had ceased to write for *Punch*, he established a monthly magazine, edited by himself and Angus B. Reach, liberally and ably illustrated by "Phiz," Henry Meadows, Hine, Nicholson, Prough, A. Mayhew, Smythe, "Cham," and others. It was *The Man in the Moon*, the first number of which appeared in January, 1847. The two volumes for 1848, which closed the publication, were wholly edited by Mr. Reach. In many respects, this was one of the best of the English illustrated comic periodicals.

In 1867 appeared *Judy*, a *Halfpenny Punch*, and *Banter*, all imitations. Of these *Judy* alone survives, and seems prosperous. Its illustrations, particularly its political cartoons, are superior to those now given in *Punch*. There also is *The Tomahawk*, remarkably well written, which gives a single engraving, printed in tints with much effect, and drawn with great spirit; the artist's signature is "Matt Morgan," which may be a pseudonyme. More recent still, also with a single engraving, is *Échoes of the Clubs*, which has no very decided character, political or satirical, but is illustrated with striking ability.

There has never been, we believe, any attempt in Scotland or Ireland to produce any publication at all resembling *Punch*. In Liverpool there have been a *Tomahawk*, a *Pan*, a *Lion*, and a *Porcupine*, all more or less critical on music and the drama. The *Porcupine*, we understand, survives and flourishes. In Melbourne, Australia, a colonial *Punch*, well written, smartly illustrated, and largely circulated, has been popular and prosperous for some years.

Illustrated comic literature has not been very successful in the United States. Various attempts have been made—*Vanity Fair* being the ablest as well as the most persistent. To a future occasion we postpone some account of these attempts, their authors, and the probable causes of their successive failures—causes, we may hint here, which arose rather from the writers than the artists of these publications.

- ART. VII.—1. *The History of Ancient Astronomy.* By M. DELAMBRE. 2 vols., 4to. 1817.
2. *Origin and Progress of Astronomy.* By JOHN NARRISON, F. R. A. S. 1 vol., 8vo. London, 1850.
3. *Megale Syntaxis; or, The Almagest.* By PTOLEMY.

THE origin of the science of astronomy is involved in impenetrable obscurity. We only know that it had an origin, but the time and place of its beginning are unknown. Here, then, the imagination can have loose reins. The human mind has, heretofore, in trying to give a probable account of the origin of the science of the stars, imagined man to be ushered into the world a grown-up, intelligent being, astonished at the beauty of the scene presented by the moon as it moves through the heavens from day to day, changing from the slender crescent to the full round orb, and then as gradually returning again to its original form; or at the scene which the stars and planets present as they move majestically onward in their accustomed rounds.

But such could not have been the course of nature. Man began the world as the child does, naturally ignorant and inexperienced, and so familiar with the scenes of nature before the development of reason, that neither sun, moon, nor stars excited his imagination. His attention was probably never called to the heavenly bodies till necessity drove him to observe them. We shall, then, probably, not be far from the truth if we suppose that man's physical wants, in the first place, impelled him to become an astronomer.

As a suitable introduction to the discoveries and improvements of Hipparchus and Ptolemy, we shall give a brief sketch of the history of astronomy before the time of the former. The wants of agriculture have required in all ages a knowledge of the motions of the sun, so that the seasons can be distinguished and their returns known. The earliest observations made for such purpose were those of the risings and the settings of the stars, especially those lying along the sun's path. The science of astronomy did not begin, however, till a series of observations had been recorded and compared with one another, and some attempt made to explain the motions and the laws of the heavenly bodies. We know but little of the antiquity of this ancient astronomy; we may judge of its early existence, however, by the astronomical periods which it has

transmitted to us, and by some correct notions which the Chaldeans and Egyptians entertained of the system of the world. The practical astronomy of these early ages seems to have been confined to the observations of the risings and the settings of the principal stars, their occultations by the moon and planets, and to the eclipses of the sun and moon. The most ancient observations of a definite character which have been transmitted to us, are those of three eclipses of the moon made in the years 719 and 720 B. C. These are cited by Ptolemy in the *Almagest*, and employed by him in determining the elements of the lunar motions.

Laplace says that astronomy is not less ancient in Egypt than in Chaldea. Long before the Christian era the Egyptians were acquainted with the excess of the year of one-fourth of a day above three hundred and sixty-five days; and a knowledge of this fact enabled them to construct the sothic period of 1460 years. It is probable, also, that they had methods of calculating eclipses.

Grecian astronomy also dates back several centuries before the Christian era. Thales, born in Miletus about 640 B. C., went to Egypt for instruction; and on his return he founded the celebrated Ionian school, in which he taught the sphericity of the earth, the obliquity of the ecliptic, and the true cause of the eclipses of the sun and moon; and he even predicted them. Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Anaxagoras were the successors of Thales; the first of whom invented the gnomon and geographical charts. Anaxagoras was persecuted by the Athenians for teaching that nature is governed by immutable laws.

From the Ionian school came Pythagoras, born at Samos, 590 B. C. He was at first a disciple of Thales; but this philosopher advised him to travel in Egypt, where he obtained a knowledge of the doctrines of the priests. He finally left his own country and retired to Italy, where he established his school. Here Pythagoras taught the doctrines of the Ionian school on a more extended scale. What particularly distinguishes the Pythagorean system of astronomy is the doctrine of the two motions of the earth, the annual and diurnal. The discoveries of this great man in the pure science of geometry are nearly equal to those in astronomy. The invention of the multiplication table and the discovery of the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid are due to Pythagoras.

After the death of Alexander, science seemed to decline in Greece, owing, perhaps, to the unsettled state of affairs

there. The establishment of the Alexandrine school by the second Ptolemy, however, gave a new impetus to the progress of astronomical science. The men of science who had been attracted thither were established in a vast edifice, which contained both an observatory and the celebrated Alexandrine library. Here they were supplied with whatever books and instruments were necessary to carry on their scientific labours. We see here, for the first time, a connected series of observations. Singular instruments were here employed, and trigonometrical methods were used in calculations. Here the celebrated Euclid, author of the *Elements of Geometry*, studied and taught.

Arystillus and Thimocares were the first observers of this rising school; they flourished about the year 300 B. C. Their observations of the principal stars of the zodiac enabled Hipparchus to discover the precession of the equinoxes; and Ptolemy founded his theory of the planets on their observations of those bodies. Here flourished the great astronomer Aristarchus, of Samos. "The most delicate elements of astronomy were the subjects of his investigations." He observed the summer solstice 281 B. C.; he measured the apparent magnitude of the sun, and the relative distances of the sun and moon, by a method which reflects great honour on the genius of that astronomer. His method was to observe the angular distance between the sun and moon, when the disk of the latter was just half enlightened, which makes known the three angles of a right-angled triangle, and this enabled him to find the ratio of the sun's distance to the moon's. In this way he found the distance of the sun about nineteen times as great as that of the moon. He also received the Pythagorean notion of the motion of the earth.

The successor of Aristarchus, Eratosthenes, is celebrated for his determination of the obliquity of the ecliptic, and for his measurement of the magnitude of the earth. He made the circumference of the earth equal to 250,000 stadia, but the length of this stadium is uncertain, so that we are unable to judge of the accuracy of the determination. Such then was the science of astronomy when Hipparchus began his researches.

Hipparchus was born at Nicaea, in Bithynia, about 200 B. C., but it is related by both Theon and Ptolemy that he made many celestial observations at Rhodes, and it is probable that the most of his works were composed at that place. It is also said that he made observations at Alexandria; but this is a point that cannot easily be

settled. "This great man," says Grant, "was at once a mathematician, an observer, and a theorist: and in all these capacities he exhibited powers of genius of the highest order: only two or three individuals can rank with him in the history of physical science."* "Not content with what had already been done, he determined to recommence every thing, and not to admit any results but those founded on a new examination of former observations, or on new observations, more exact than those of his predecessors."†

Hipparchus was probably the inventor and certainly the first to employ trigonometry in astronomical researches, by which the facility of fixing with precision the places of the celestial bodies, and of exhibiting the variations in their movements, was, in an important degree, augmented. He first distinguished himself by writing a commentary on the astronomical poem of Aratus. In this work he solved a problem of considerable intricacy, and of great practical utility in astronomical science in his day. He supposed a given star to be situated in the horizon, its right ascension and declination, and also the latitude of the place of observation to be known; and from these data he deduces the value of the diurnal arc described by the star, the longitude, right ascension of the point of the ecliptic which is in the horizon, the right ascension of the mid-heaven, and the culminating point of the ecliptic at the time when the star is in the horizon. A work which Hipparchus wrote on the simultaneous risings and settings of the stars, and one in twelve books on the calculation of a table of *chord lines* inscribed in a circle, are lost. The latter was probably to be used in computations in plane and spherical trigonometry similarly to that of a table of *sines* at the present day.

Much of the labour in a fixed observatory of the present day, is to observe the positions of the fixed stars, for they are the basis upon which the science of astronomy rests. They are a sort of landmarks to which reference is continually being made in determining the positions of a moving celestial body. Hipparchus conferred a great benefit on the science of the stars by forming a catalogue of 1080 of those which were called fixed. We are uncertain whether the positions of the stars were given by their right ascensions and declinations, or latitudes and longitudes. It is said that he was induced to form his

* His. Phys. Ast., p. ii. † Laplace, Syst. of the World, vol. ii., p. 267.

catalogue by the appearance of a temporary star which was visible in the day-time, so that posterity might tell whether new stars had made their appearance, or old ones passed away.

The ancient method of determining the situation of a star or planet, with respect to the equinox, was to obtain the distance of it in right ascension, or longitude, from the sun by the intervention of the moon. Because the sun and star could not be seen at the same time, the distance of the latter from the moon was measured, and from the known synodical motion of the moon her distance from the sun was found, and thence that of the star; and as the distance of the sun from the equinoctial points was known, the longitude of the star was thus ascertained.* But the errors in the solar and lunar tables in those times necessarily precluded all idea of accuracy in such determinations. Many centuries elapsed before the lunar movements were sufficiently well known to give the moon's place in the heavens with accuracy.

Another important discovery made by Hipparchus, is that of the precession of the equinoxes. Aristyllus and Thimocares, in observing the longitude of the star *Spica Virginis*, found it equal to 172° , and Hipparchus, one hundred and seventy years afterwards, found it equal to 174° , showing a change of 2° in the interval, or about $42''$ annually. As there was no change in the latitude of the star, the change in the longitude could easily be accounted for by supposing a retrograde movement of the equinoctial points. Modern astronomers, by comparing the position of *Eta Canis Major*, as given by Hipparchus, with its position in our day, find the annual precession equal to about $50' 8''$ greater than that astronomer's determination.

The length of the solar day, or the interval of two successive arrivals of the sun to the meridian of any place, was found by Hipparchus, from his observations of the daily motion of the sun, to be variable in different seasons; and in order to reduce this to its mean value, he is said to have applied a correction similar to our equation of time. Another source of inconvenience then existing was the practice of beginning the day at sunrise. To remedy this Hipparchus changed the beginning of the day from sunrise to midnight. The modern astronomer makes the astronomical day begin at noon,

* Narrison's Origin and Prog. of Ast., p. 222.

and considers it as consisting of twenty-four hours, and not of twice twelve. The method of Hipparchus is still followed in reckoning time for civil purposes. "It is worthy of observation, that in or before the time of Hipparchus, the hour of the night at which any phenomenon occurred, was determined, as we are informed by Ptolemy, by observing what star was on the meridian at the time; for the right ascension of the sun being known, the difference between this and the right ascension of the star is the time required."*

One of the principal objects of the astronomer is to determine the laws by which the movements of the sun, moon, and planets are regulated. As soon as Hipparchus had determined the positions of the principal fixed stars, he applied himself to the difficult task of investigating the theory of the motions of the sun and moon. Here he displayed the resources of his great genius, and we find him comparable in that respect to the greatest astronomers of modern times. The length of the tropical year is the first thing in the solar theory that must be determined with exactness; not only for the regulation of the calendar, but because the elements of the apparent orbit of the sun are dependent upon it. Astronomers before the time of Hipparchus had found this element by comparing the observations of the Chaldeans and Egyptians with those in their own day; but Hipparchus was not satisfied with those ancient observations, because they were not sufficiently exact, and he sought for some of a later date that would answer his purpose better. Sometimes the great length of time between two observations will more than compensate for the want of accuracy of one of them, but we cannot allow too great a margin of this kind. Aristarchus observed the time when the sun was at the summer solstice in the year 281 B. C., and 145 years afterwards Hipparchus made a similar observation of the same solstice and he found it to happen twelve hours, or half a day, later than it ought if the year had consisted exactly of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, a circumstance which shows that this latter period is in excess a little of the true length of the year, for exactly 145 years had elapsed; but by assuming the year to consist of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, the time lacked half a day of making 145 years. If we divide 0.5 of a day by 145 we find 0.00345, which, being taken from 365.25 , we have

* Narrion, p. 226.

365·24655 days for the true length of the solar year. This is in excess of the truth by 6 minutes and 13 seconds only; since, according to Laplace, the tropical year was then 4·2 seconds shorter than in the present age. This investigation of Hipparchus led him to suggest an improvement in the calendar by leaving out one of the intercalated days (of every fourth year) at the end of every three hundred years.

Ptolemy informs us that Hipparchus found, from observation, that the interval of time from the vernal equinox to the summer solstice was equal to $94\frac{1}{2}$ days, and from the latter to the autumnal equinox there were $92\frac{1}{2}$ days; from which it follows that the summer half of the year consisted of 187 days, and the winter half of 178 days. "To explain these differences, Hipparchus supposed the sun to move uniformly in a circular orbit; but, instead of placing the earth in the centre of it, he supposed it removed the twenty-fourth part of the radius, and fixed the apogee in the sixth degree of Gemini. From these data he formed the first solar tables to be found in the history of astronomy."*

After establishing the theory of the motions of the sun, Hipparchus applied himself to an investigation of the lunar theory. The theory of the moon's motions is by far more difficult than that of the sun; indeed, more labour has been expended on the lunar theory alone than on that of all the other celestial bodies together. Hipparchus availed himself of the registers of the ancient eclipses, and probably of many direct observations of the phases of the moon, as these latter would afford many useful approximations to the lunar elements. By comparing the ancient observations with those of his own time, he found the mean synodical revolution of the moon equal to 29·5297 days, and the mean sidereal revolution equal to 27·3214 days. He also found that the line of apsides completed a revolution in 3229·3 days, and the line of nodes in 6806·6 days. These numbers are close approximations to the truth; especially shall we consider them so when we remember the difficulties which Hipparchus had to encounter in determining them. By comparing these results with those deduced from the most accurate observations of modern times, it is proved that the moon's mean motion has been accelerated since the days of Hipparchus, and the theory of gravitation con-

* "System of the World," vol. ii., p. 268.

firms the result, giving numbers that agree almost precisely with those found from observation.

To find the variation of the apparent diameter of the moon, he again had recourse to lunar eclipses. In this way it was found that the moon's apparent diameter in perigee exceeded that in apogee by $2' 10''$, the true value being about double this. As soon as it was discovered that the magnitude of the earth bore a definite relation to the distance of the sun and moon, it must have been perceived that the apparent places of these bodies would be affected by the position which the observer occupies on the surface of the first body. This change of apparent place was denominated *parallax*, and Ptolemy informs us that Hipparchus not only understood the nature of the element, but he was in possession of rules for computing its amount. He called the horizontal parallax of the moon $57'$, and that of the sun $3'$, according to the determination of the sun's distance by Aristarchus.

After having revised and improved the lunar theory, Hipparchus turned his attention to the planets. In most of the ancient systems of astronomy, the earth was considered as a quiescent body in the centre of the universe with the celestial bodies revolving around it. The first and nearest was the moon, then Mercury, Venus, the sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn; after which came the sphere of the fixed stars. Hipparchus found the time occupied by a synodical revolution of each of the planets, or the interval between two successive conjunctions with the sun, as follows: Mercury, 115·875 days; Venus, 583·95 days; Mars, 779·68 days; Jupiter, 398·89 days; Saturn, 378·09 days. The sidereal revolutions were as follows: Mercury, Venus, and the sun, each a year; Mars, 1·88 years; Jupiter, 11·86 years; Saturn, 29·03 years. These numbers are approximately correct, except the sidereal periods of Mercury and Venus.

In concluding this sketch of the labours of Hipparchus, we may add, that besides his invention or improvement of trigonometry and the calculation of tables to facilitate astronomical calculations, the improvement of the theories of the sun, moon, and planets, and the correction of the tables of their movements, he must have applied himself for many years to the observations of the heavenly bodies, so as to leave behind him numerous correct data for the improvement of those theories to which he had devoted the powers of his gifted mind. He died about the year 125 B. C.

Between the times of Hipparchus and Ptolemy, a space of about three hundred years, there flourished no astronomers of any particular note; or such as added any thing of importance to what was already known. Ptolemy was born at Ptolemais in Egypt, about the year 100 of our era. He laboured to extend and perfect what Hipparchus had begun. The results of all his labours are embodied in his great work, the *Almagest*, which is a complete treatise on the science of astronomy. In the first book of this work, Ptolemy gives the result of his researches on the obliquity of the ecliptic. His method was to observe the zenith distances of the sun on the days of the summer and the winter solstices, which gave him the double obliquity equal to about $47^{\circ} 42' 30''$, half of which is $23^{\circ} 51' 15''$. His method of ascertaining the length of the tropical year, was the same as that practised by Hipparchus, and he found a result coinciding with that of the last-named astronomer. This exact coincidence has given rise to a suspicion, since several different comparisons give the same result, that his observations are not real. That he was not a very accurate observer seems probable from the fact that he made the latitude of Alexandria, the scene of his labours, a quarter of a degree too small.* Ptolemy does not seem to have improved the solar theory of Hipparchus.

In the fourth book of the *Almagest*, Ptolemy investigates the theory of the moon's motions. Hipparchus had determined the eccentricity of the moon's orbit, or the radius of the epicycle in his theory, the maximum equations of her centre, and the place of her apogees. The equations of the moon's centre, or the principal inequality, as it was also called, was found by a comparison of the mean place of that body with her true place at the time of an eclipse; and Hipparchus seems to have concluded that the same correction applied in any situation with respect to the sun; but we are indebted to Ptolemy for the discovery of the fact that it is only applicable when she is in syzygy. This inequality is known as the *erection*. He constructed an instrument, by means of which the positions of the moon could be observed in other parts of her orbit than in syzygy, and he "found that they sometimes agreed, but were more frequently at variance with the calculated places; the greatest amount of error always taking place at quadrature and vanishing altogether

* Narrion, pp. 256-7.

at syzygy. What must, however, have been a source of great perplexity to Ptolemy, when he attempted to investigate the law of this new irregularity, was to find that it did not return in any quadrature—in some quadratures it totally disappeared, and in others amounted to $2^{\circ} 39'$, which was its maximum value.* These changes are owing to the fact, that the evection is proportional to the sum of twice the mean angular distance of the sun from the moon, diminished by the mean angular distance of the moon from the perigee.

To represent this new inequality, Ptolemy caused the moon, in his theory, to move on the circumference of an epicycle whose centre was moved on the circumference of an eccentric circle whose centre was carried in a retrograde order on the circumference of another circle whose centre was the centre of the earth. One of the erroneous notions of the ancients, was that, because circular motion is the most simple and natural, it was necessarily that of the heavenly bodies. After being retarded for some time in his progress by the same notion, Kepler finally overthrew it, and established the elliptic theory. Although Ptolemy's theory might be made to represent approximately the principal inequalities of the moon's motion, yet it never could explain the variation in distance; and could he have measured with his instruments the change in the apparent diameter of the moon as it revolves around the earth, it would have shown him that his theory was entirely at variance with nature, since the diameter varies inversely as the distance.

In the planetary theory there was no question in reference to the positions of Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn with respect to the earth and sun, but Mercury and Venus, owing to the peculiarity of their apparent motions, gave the ancients no little difficulty. There were three opinions respecting them. The hypothesis of the first class placed them between the sun and the earth, Mercury being nearest to the latter; the second placed them beyond the sun; and lastly, the Egyptians, more sagacious than the others, made them move round the sun according to nature. Ptolemy adopted the first hypothesis. Had he followed the Egyptians, the simplicity which it would have introduced into his theory might have led him to the discovery of the true system of the world. Every new discovery of irregularities in the motion of the

* Godfray's Lunar Theory, p. 105.

celestial bodies added new difficulties to the theory ; and instead of being confirmed by the progress of the science, it grew more and more complicated ; and this alone should have convinced the ancients that their system was not that of nature. "But in considering it," says Laplace, "as a method of adapting the celestial motions to calculation, this first attempt of the human understanding toward an object so very complicated, does great honour to the sagacity of its author."

In preparing his catalogue of stars, Ptolemy has been accused of copying that of Hipparchus, and allowing for the motion of the equinoxes in the interval. In determining the motion of the equinoctial points, he arrived at a result agreeing with that of Hipparchus. But Laplace* shows that the erroneous determination was owing to the error then existing in the observed length of the tropical year. "The astronomical edifice raised by Ptolemy, subsisted nearly fourteen centuries, and now that it is entirely destroyed, his *Almagest*, considered as a depositary of ancient observations, is one of the most precious monuments of antiquity." Ptolemy rendered great service to geography by collecting all the known longitudes and latitudes of different places, and by laying the foundation of projections for the construction of geographical charts. He composed a treatise on optics, which has been preserved. In this work he explains the influence of astronomical refractions. He also wrote treatises on chronology, music, gnomonics, and mechanics. His *Megale Syntaxis* was translated by the Arabs into their language, and called by them the *Almagest*. In the thirteenth century it was translated from Arabic into Latin, under the auspices of the emperor Frederick the Second. This step was attended with the most beneficial consequences to the study of astronomy, for the work could now be read by most persons of learning.

ART. VIII.—1. *Articles of Impeachment against the President of the United States for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.*

2. *Speeches of Managers and of Counsel for Defence and other documents.* May, 1868.

No party is so strong that it can afford to be rash in important actions. Five hundred persons more than one

* *System of the World*, vol. ii., pp. 278-9.

cannot set reason at defiance with impunity. Above all others those who would accomplish a revolution for their own benefit without bloodshed, must be calm and thoughtful. It behooves them to weigh all the circumstances, and by no means to lose sight of the tendency which opinion and feeling, like other things, have to change; they should remember that although weak minds are in general the most fickle, strong minds are the most likely to be influenced by the promptings of justice and truth. The former may, indeed, entertain the same notions for years; but the latter reject theirs as soon as they discover that they are wrong; they are not afraid to be accused of inconsistency, because they have the sense to understand that it reflects honour rather than discredit on them, as men and citizens, to be wiser to-day than they were yesterday.

The best men may be set aside in a day, or in an hour, by the sword, under pretence of their being the worst; but it is rarely that any who are not real criminals are treated as such, when the tribunal before which they are arraigned has had time for reflection; never we think when the tribunal is enlightened and impartial. Thus it is that the impeachers have injured themselves much more than the President whom they have impeached.

All who are in a passion fancy themselves stronger than they really are; they also fancy that the object of their wrath is worse than he is. For these reasons men of sense wait until their passion cools; then, if after due deliberation the things which first annoyed them have still the same aspect, it is but right they should pursue the course which their conscience and judgment prompt.

The impeachers have done the reverse, and now that they have had sufficient time for reflection, we feel convinced that they are by no means surprised themselves at the result. Certainly no one is really surprised who was not actuated by selfish motives, or by excessive partisan feeling, or who did not entertain a low opinion of the Senate. If the truth were known, the surprise of the most unprincipled of the impeachers was not that the President should be acquitted, but that so little could be proved against any man occupying so prominent a position; they might well say that not one of them would have been found so innocent of "high crimes and misdemeanors," had he been placed in the same position as Andrew Johnson.

It is not to be expected that men who have acted so

rash and unwise a part would admit this, but it would certainly be more to their credit to do so than to attribute unworthy motives to the men of their party who had the manliness and honesty to prefer justice to partisan favour. In our opinion every American citizen, without distinction of party, should regard the acquittal of the President as a cause of congratulation, if for no other reason than that it has vindicated the honour of the Senate of the United States. We are well aware that there are many thousands who do not view it in this light, but the day will come when they will change their mind. Large numbers have changed already, brief as the time is since the trial was concluded. We indulge in no exaggeration when we say that nearly half of those among the public at large who were in favour of the removal of the President when he was first impeached, became his warmest friends during the progress of the trial; not because they liked his politics or himself better than they did previously, but because they were unwilling to see the President of the United States persecuted and insulted, for what was at worst but an error in judgment. All who had a thought beyond their daily task, asked themselves what would they say, or how would they feel, if any foreign nation had abused our Chief Magistrate as the impeachers did, ostensibly for the good of the country, but really for the purpose of gratifying their own ambition.

It is better, however, that the President should be brought even to a mock trial than that recourse should be had to bloodshed; but it is by no means certain that the impeachers are entitled to the credit of this. Those who make a great outcry, under any pretence whatever, are seldom endowed with courage; they are very much like women in this as in other respects. Mr. Butler, whom the managers fitly put forward as their representative, would much rather use his tongue, coarse and pointless, though rasping, as it is, than his sword, except he could hit with the latter from some dark, safe place.

But had he been even brave, and had all his accomplices been brave also—which, we admit, is rather an extravagant supposition—even then they would hardly have ventured on a bloody revolution. Not, indeed, that they would have much scruple to strike down any man or men who presented an obstacle to their ambitious projects and love of pelf; and, if we are to judge some of them from their conduct in the past, women would fare

no better, but rather worse, at their hands. Fortunately, our people are neither bloodthirsty nor fond of revolutions. They have demonstrated to the world that none are braver when their country needs their bravery, but their innate good sense and intelligence give no encouragement to conspirators. Catiline himself, could he have lived in our time, would not have dared to urge the Northern States to endanger the life of the Republic by bloodshed and plunder. In the South, indeed, he might have succeeded in an evil hour. This the late rebellion has shown, but, alas, how sad, how irreparable are the results even of that gigantic effort! It is an idle boast, therefore, for the impeachers to say that they had recourse to moral and legal means for the removal of the President. Had they attempted to use violence, they would have brought still more contempt on themselves than they have, if that were possible, and they would have endangered their precious lives at the same time.

We have no disposition to increase the scorn which the impeachers have brought on themselves by what they pretend to regard as "moral and legal means," but which, as the world knows, were neither moral nor legal. Even Butler has had punishment enough. Like Thersites, his prototype, he has excited ridicule by his gravest efforts. Far be it from us to find fault with any one for the defects or infirmities of nature. But we cannot help being struck with the resemblance between the chief reviler of the President and the person on whom Ulysses inflicted such ignominious punishment for abusing his betters. First the poet describes him as squinting* and lame of one foot.† Then he is addressed by Ulysses with the utmost scorn: "If I shall find thee any longer acting foolishly," says the hero, "as indeed no where no longer, then, be the head on the shoulders of Ulysses: not any longer may I be called the father of Telemachus, if, having taken thee, I do not strip thee of thy garments, both upper coat and tunic, and those which cover thy shame."‡ In order to give due emphasis to these words, Ulysses struck the poor wight on the back, so that the boaster and reviler writhed and began to cry like a woman. Pope, in commenting on this, says:—"What is further observable is, that Thersites is never heard of after this, his first appearance; such a scandalous character is to be taken no more notice of

* φαλχός. † χῶλος δ' ἑτερον ποδα. ‡ Iliad, II., v. 259 *et seq.*

than just to show that it is despised." But there is another point of similarity. The Greeks had become very much dissatisfied with their leaders; they were almost in a mutinous condition when they were addressed on the subject by Thersites, who, be it observed, was well "versed in many and indecent terms;" in other words, he was a pretty fair specimen of a "stump orator," without principle, decency, or courage. Had he remained quiet, the probability was that the Greeks would withdraw and leave Agamemnon in the lurch, a ruined and degraded chieftain. But Thersites turns the scale at once in his favour; the gross and indecent abuse he received from so worthless a character awakened the sympathy of the whole army, and all were delighted at the chastisement which the brawler received. Even Ulysses had never done any thing more popular than this. "He has done innumerable good things," said the Greeks, "but now, truly, he has done this, by far the best, by silencing this reproachful reviler from his harangues."*

Now, if Homer had only introduced some silver spoons, or other similar utensils, into his description, the parallel would have been almost perfect. At all events, the resemblance is sufficiently close. Thersites saved the glory of the Greeks by causing them to do the reverse of what he urged upon them: he made them be true to themselves and their country, instead of being false to both, as he advised them, with all the earnestness and scurrility of a smatterer in oratory. And certain it is that the conduct of Butler has had a similar effect on the the people of the United States. He has saved the American Senate, as Thersites saved the Greek army. No one, therefore, should have any feeling against Mr. Butler. True, it is against his will he saved the Senate from disgrace, but when one has accomplished a good result, it is ungracious to scrutinize too closely the means which he used.

But to extend the parallel a little farther, if the Greeks had reason to be grateful to the wise Ulysses for restraining the "reproachful reviler" and exhibiting him in his true character to his countrymen, the American people have equal reason to be grateful to Chief-Justice Chase. The latter did not, indeed, describe Butler from head to toe, as Ulysses described his prototype, nor did he inflict any blows on his posterior parts, but he chastised him

* *Iliad*, II., v. 275.

quite as severely as if he had done both. Some of those brief remarks which he occasionally addressed to the "honourable manager" were abundantly descriptive; it was evident that they hurt, too, sometimes, although Butler is by no means sensitive as long as he is in danger of no harder weapons than irony or rebuke. But there is an eloquence in silence, and in the expression of the countenance, and we have never seen it used with more powerful effect than by the Chief-Justice at the impeachment trial. In a word, our impression was, after having spent many weary hours listening to the managers, that no jurist of Europe or America could have conducted himself in a more dignified or impartial manner than Chief-Justice Chase did during this trial. All the managers were more or less offensive to him; Butler was particularly so. Neither the managers, nor their senatorial abettors ever addressed him by his proper title, but always as "Mr. President." He never made even a suggestion as to the law or propriety of any question evolved during the trial, for which he was not treated with rudeness in one form or another; yet never, for one moment, did he seem to lose his equanimity. We made the following remark in our last number, for we had never seen his Honour preside at any court: "If Chief-Justice Chase has the wisdom and moral courage to avail himself of it, he has now an opportunity of rendering himself quite as illustrious as Lord Abinger; he has an opportunity of causing himself to be quoted as an authority in favour of constitutional government and the rights of man, by the jurists of all future ages."*

He has proved to the world that he possessed both the wisdom and the moral courage to administer justice impartially, and oppose wrong, and we hold that he has rendered himself illustrious accordingly. The majority of even those who voted the President guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanours" will live long enough to see, if they do not already, that, after all, it was fortunate for the country that so wise a statesman and so impartial a jurist occupied the supreme bench at so momentous a crisis; not that he could compel any senator to vote contrary to his inclination, but that the influence of a distinguished lawyer, combining with great forensic ability the wisdom of the statesman, could not fail to produce favourable results.

* No. XXXII., p. 380.

Nor does any intelligent person doubt that the straightforward, manly course pursued by the Chief-Justice has influenced the issue of the trial. Had a narrow-minded fanatic or partisan been in his place, it is certain that the President would have been convicted, and this would have produced much more serious results than even the impeachers had calculated upon. As it is, no harm has been done, but really much good. The most ambitious and violent partisans will learn a useful lesson from the acquittal of the President. None of that genus will be so ready in future to make frivolous charges, however anxious they may be to crush their opponents in order to serve their own interests; whereas, future presidents, upon the other hand, will be careful not to leave themselves in the power of unprincipled demagogues.

For these reasons, if we had five hundred votes to-morrow, and that Chief-Justice Chase were a candidate for the Presidency, we would unhesitatingly give all to him. We think that all who have the welfare of the country at heart should be actuated by the same feeling. Nor is it by way of rewarding the Chief-Justice we would pursue this course; we should wish to see him President for the country's sake, not for his—because we think that he is eminently qualified for the position, and that his administration would command the respect of all intelligent, impartial men at home and abroad.

We do not make this remark through any hostility to General Grant; for we entertain no such feeling. As long as there was a single battalion in the field against the Union, none were more in favour of prosecuting the war than we; none set a higher value on the splendid victories of General Grant; and we have always maintained that he deserved the warmest gratitude of the country for having saved the Republic in spite of the persistent efforts of one of the greatest generals of the age, and the bravest armies. If the rebel armies were not superior to the Union armies, it was because the latter could not be surpassed; and if Lee was not superior to Grant as a general, it was because the latter had no superior in the world, in our opinion, in the particular kind of warfare which it was necessary to adopt in the extensive woods and morasses of the South.

Such has been our estimate of General Grant since he gained his three first victories; nevertheless we have always thought that there are at least a hundred men in the United States who are much better qual-

ified for the Presidency than he. But, with the sole exception of Chief-Justice Chase, none of those yet prominently mentioned as likely to be his opponents, are among the number. We would certainly vote for him rather than for any of the rest, whether they call themselves Republicans or Democrats; but we should decidedly prefer the Chief-Justice to the General, for, although the sword is an excellent thing in time of war, political sagacity and statesmanship are much more useful in time of peace; and they are much more likely to maintain peace when once established. Even his enemies freely admitted that Wellington was a great general. No public man has ever been more idolized than the "Iron Duke" has been by the British people of all classes; it is certain that no general ever possessed in a higher degree the gratitude of a whole nation; yet there were many men to whom England preferred to commit the reins of government, although he was always willing enough, if not anxious, to be Premier. Even when he was nominally at the head of the ministry, Sir Robert Peel, who could not command a corporal's guard, and who scarcely knew the difference between a carbine and a howitzer, was the acting man. The duke was nearly as much out of place in the cabinet when any important business had to be transacted, as Sir Robert would have been in the British camp when "the guards" were attacked with characteristic impetuosity by Napoleon's cuirassiers.

But we fear that General Grant would be still more out of place in the cabinet; and it is not a military chieftain the country needs just now, but a statesman. No one pretends that General Grant is a statesman; at least we are not aware that any such claim has been made on his behalf, even by his most enthusiastic admirers; whereas none deny the statesmanlike abilities of Mr. Chase.

It is urged that, if we are at peace with the world now, we may be at war with one or more of the most powerful nations before the term of the next president shall have expired. This is not at all likely; and still less likely is it that we shall have any great rebellion put down. But assuming the contrary, was Mr. Lincoln, under whose auspices the greatest and most formidable rebellion of modern times was put down, a military chieftain? Not one of all our presidents knew less about military science, or had less disposition to take the field; yet it is universally admitted by the very men who have

nominated General Grant that not one, save Washington alone, has deserved more of his country than Mr. Lincoln.

One of the good results of the Impeachment trial was to have brought Mr. Chase thus prominently before the public, by proving him superior to partisanship. But has any thing proved that General Grant is not a partisan? Nay, have not many things proved rather conclusively that he is? His course towards the President in relation to the War Department was certainly not straightforward; even according to his own account he acted the part of a partisan. Does any one believe that if he could have presided at the impeachment trial, he would have been as impartial as Mr. Chase?

As to the politics of one or the other, we are not, we repeat, in the least influenced by them. We like a Republican quite as much as a Democrat, and a Democrat as much as a Republican. If self-interest would induce us to favour one more than the other, the Republicans would certainly have the best claim upon us. Most assuredly we have more friends amongst them than amongst the Democrats. We have denounced the Radicals for their vindictive policy towards the South, and for their still more vindictive persecution of the President, although we have in general found them, also, much better friends than the Democrats. Even when we wanted a ticket of admission to the High Court of Impeachment, we called on no Democrat for it; but on a Republican and Radical; nor could any one have responded to us more politely than Senator Morgan, who very gracefully and kindly presented us a ticket which he had addressed to a personal friend, while, to our own knowledge, he had to refuse many Radicals for the same privilege.

Indeed, were we influenced by partisan feeling—did we prefer a Democrat as such to a Republican, we should think that, after all, Grant is at heart more of a Democrat than Chase. But we do not care whether he is or not; we are convinced that our Chief-Justice is a better statesman than the commander of our armies; we are satisfied that the former is better qualified in every respect to be President of the United States than the latter; and, accordingly, we prefer him. But we would not prefer Pendleton; still less would we prefer Seymour; we would give General Grant our vote in preference to either; because he has served his country, whereas we believe that neither of the gentlemen just mentioned has

served anybody but himself, and, perhaps, "the party." Who can pretend that it is so with Mr. Chase? We think that it may well be doubted, whether he has not served his country as Secretary of the Treasury and Chief-Justice quite as much as General Grant, although the good he has done may not be so obvious.

It is a remarkable fact that some of the very people who justly laud our Chief-Justice for his impartial and manly conduct during the impeachment trial, call on the President to remove all his cabinet officers. There is nothing the Chief-Justice is more highly praised for than for his effort to shield from conviction one whom he believed did not deserve to be convicted. Certainly, nothing can be more meritorious, nothing more honourable to human nature than to protect the victim of persecution; especially when that persecution is the result of obvious conspiracy. But, with the sole exception of Mr. Seward, whose testimony in regard to the difficulty between the President and General Grant was not at all straightforward, all the cabinet officers remained faithful to their superior. When the President was impeached, the almost universal opinion among all parties and classes was that he would be convicted; not, indeed, because he was guilty but because those who sought his downfall were all-powerful. None doubted at the time that, had the cabinet officers consulted their own interest, they would leave the President to his fate. Nor can we believe that they entertained a different opinion on the subject themselves; but, with the exception already noticed, all stood manfully by the President.

The Secretaries of the Treasury and of the Navy distinguished themselves particularly by their manly and honourable fidelity. They took, what all believed at the time to be, the part of the weak against the strong; the part of the apparently doomed victim against his all-powerful enemies. Neither threats nor promises could induce them to swerve in the slightest degree from the course pointed out to them by truth, justice, and honour. They were willing to give their testimony before the High Court and the world in favour of the President, because they believed him innocent. Precisely because their fidelity was known to the Managers, because it was well understood that they would speak out boldly and honestly, they were not allowed to testify. Now, the President is called upon to remove those who thus continued faithful to him to the last! Were he capable of such base ingratitude, might

it not well be said that, after all, he deserved to be impeached?

But would not the nation also show its ingratitude did it sanction, much less recommend, any such course? While every enlightened nation that is friendly to the United States bestows the highest praise on our Secretary of the Treasury, for the able and statesman-like manner in which he has managed our financial system, are we ourselves to reward him only with reproaches? It would become us much better, as an intelligent and patriotic people, to bear in mind that precisely because he is an honest as well as an able man, because he is a faithful and fearless public servant, he has been persistently abused by certain parties—by parties who would have been the loudest in his praise had he only been less scrupulous in his care of the public money.

It is not strange that those who clamour for the removal of the ablest and most upright Secretary of the Treasury we have ever had, or are likely to have during the present generation, should also call for the removal of the Secretary of the Navy, for no better reason than that his hair is gray. It is not strange even that they sneer at him for being old, as if age were a disgrace; whereas the most illustrious statesmen, of ancient and modern times, have never served their country better than when they were much older and much less vigorous than Secretary Welles. Surely, one who was able to serve during the war, and under whose auspices our navy elicited the admiration of all Europe, and gained a prestige which it never had before, cannot be too old now to serve a few years longer in time of peace. Were he even superannuated, it would become us badly to treat him in this manner; but not one of our public functionaries, of any age, works harder, or is at his post earlier or later, than the same well-tried, uncompromising, indefatigable Secretary of the Navy.

We do not believe that the President would be guilty of the baseness to which he is thus prompted. The real state of the case is, that neither Mr. McCulloch nor Mr. Welles has any disposition to remain in office any longer. We should not be surprised to learn before the present number of our journal shall have been issued, that both had retired, not in compliance with the wish of the President, but against his will. Neither would withdraw from the Chief Magistrate of the Republic as long as he was in any danger; but now that justice has triumphed in his

case, they are quite willing to give others an opportunity of serving their country better than they, if they can do it; or if the majority of the nation think they can. If they do not withdraw in this manner, we are convinced that it is because they have been dissuaded from it by men who are capable of appreciating their services. It is true, that there may be no need for the navy for some time to come, but we have already paid far too dearly for the lesson that it is not when war has actually broken out we should prepare our fleets for active service.

Be this as it may, at no period of our history has it been more important that our finances should be skilfully managed than it is at present; and who has the necessary abilities, experience, and integrity to manage them in such a manner as to enable us to return to specie payments without creating a revulsion, or injuring the national credit, and, consequently, the national honour, if Mr. McCulloch retires? We really do not know one, save Mr. Chase, whose position precludes him from returning to the Treasury. Mr. Fessenden is, indeed, honest and upright, and is by no means an indifferent political economist, but we confess we have not much faith in his financial theories.

There are, however, two cabinet officers whose retirement, or removal, would be no serious loss to the nation—namely, the Secretary of State, and the Postmaster-General. Mr. Seward has never proved himself a statesman. The best that could be said of him in his palmiest days was, that he was a wily and not very reliable politician. During the war he was constantly blundering; he never was able to comprehend the position in which the country was placed. Had he been a man of a different calibre—had he possessed even ordinary political foresight or sagacity, and known how to avail himself of it, the Southern Confederacy would never have been recognised by any of the great nations of Europe as a belligerent power. He really encouraged France and England to do what they did by his quibbles and prevarications. The manner in which he wavered from day to day—flatly contradicting in one long letter, what he positively asserted, or maintained as an “eternal principle,” in another—made most of the nations of Europe think that the fate of the Republic was sealed. Indeed, we narrowly escaped being involved by him in a war with France and England.

It is true, however, that Mr. Seward evinced consid-

erable capacity, but not in statesmanship, or even in politics; he proved himself an excellent, though rather tyrannical, police officer. Even Fouché was not more prompt, or more cunning in making arrests. By his accomplishments in this department he rendered some of our forts nearly as celebrated as the French Bastille; but as there is nothing of this kind to be done now, at least in the North, Mr. Seward's services can be dispensed with for the remainder of President Johnson's term. Then with the leisure for thought thus afforded him for seven or eight months he might be able to alter his views to such an extent that he could be a thorough Radical or Democrat, as the case might be, by the fourth of March, and consequently be able to serve his country, without injuring his conscience, under the new *régime*.

We do not know whether Mr. Randall possesses equal facility in altering his principles to suit the times; we rather think not, however: what he seems to surpass all other postmasters in is, putting letters and periodicals astray. We do not think he does so intentionally; doubtless he cannot help it; but certainly the nation can better spare him than so many letters; and if the only loss we suffer from the Impeachment trial be that of the services of Messrs. Seward and Randall for a few months, it will be admitted that it has not proved a very serious affair after all.

IX.—NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

BELLES LETTRES.

Woman's Wrongs: A Counter-Irritant. By GAIL HAMILTON. 16mo, pp. 212. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868.

WE have often been told that Gail Hamilton is a very clever writer, but this is the first of her productions which we have found time to read; we trust it is not a fair specimen. We are very willing to believe that her stories are very good, at least for children and for adults who have no thoughts of their own; but we cannot help thinking that she is a very indifferent moralist, and that her philosophy is rather crude. It is very evident, however, that she thinks differently herself; and doubtless there are many honest people who accept her own estimate of her genius, and regard her as a shining light. Be this as it may, we should have found no fault with her performances had she not assumed the

character of a new lawgiver, and as such sought to cast Moses, Solon, Confucius, and Paul into the shade, as mere snatterers and blunderers.

That a woman should be the champion of women is perhaps right enough; that is, when they need a champion; when they are really wronged, and when the men have become so degenerate, that instead of protecting, they aid in oppressing her. But is this true of the men of America? Is it true of the men of any civilized country? That some women are wronged is very true, but are not men wronged also; nay, does not man wrong his fellow-man much oftener and more readily than he wrongs woman. But we are speaking of veritable wrongs, whereas the wrongs so valiantly attacked by Gail Hamilton belong exclusively to the imaginary species.

Women are wronged, our author tells us, because they are not allowed to vote; because it is denied that they are equal to men; because they are not permitted to occupy certain positions now generally monopolized by men; because in short, they are prevented from discarding their petticoats and wearing pantaloons in their stead.

No doubt there are ladies who regard these as great evils, but do they belong in general to the respectable class? Is it the modest and virtuous class of women that want to go to the polls and compete for those offices whose influence even on the ruder sex is so degrading? By no means; and it is equally certain that it is not that class who want to employ such champions as Gail Hamilton, or that set any value on such books as "Woman's Wrongs." At the same time we entirely acquit our author of any intention to do wrong; nay, we readily believe that her wish is to do good, but the tendency of her book is to do mischief, by rendering weak-minded women discontented with their present position, and anxious to obtrude themselves into a sphere which is foreign to their nature, and in which few, if any, of the sex escape contamination.

It requires little reflection to see that women who are intelligent, modest, and gentle, need no laws to entitle them to vote: their voice is always heard without any such law; nay, they are much more powerful in their parlours and dining-rooms than the most favourable franchise law could possibly render them at the polls. Nor is it alone in republics that their influence is all pervading; in the most gloomy despotisms, where no voting is recognized, the softening voice of woman is heard, and her influence is felt, although it may not be perceived. The worst tyrants have yielded to her modest and touching appeals as a wife, mother, or lover, what he would have contemptuously denied had she claimed it on the ground of her being equal to man, as a politician, a soldier, a lawyer, an astronomer, &c., &c.

But let us turn our attention to "Woman's Wrongs" for a few moments, and allow Gail to speak for herself, and show whether we do her injustice or not. Our author takes up, as a sort of text, some letters written by the Rev. Dr. Todd on "Woman's Rights." We know as

little about Dr. Todd personally as we do about Gail Hamilton; and certainly we would rather agree with the lady than with the gentleman, if it were possible for us to do so conscientiously, but whoever Dr. Todd is, we hold that he is a much better logician, moralist, and philosopher than Gail Hamilton. This opinion we have formed from the extracts which the lady has given in her book; for we have never seen the performances of which "Woman's Wrongs" purports to be a review, nor have we ever heard of them from any other source. In general, his arguments, as quoted by Gail, are pretty sound; but those by which she pretends to refute them are, in general, no arguments. The lady is very flippant. She is at no loss for words, but, unhappily, she fails to imbue them with much sense. She gives a quotation from the Doctor, finds fault with his grammar, and is somewhat abusive of himself, and then flies off at a tangent, to pick up a few things that have no conceivable bearing on the argument which she fancies she is all the time "refuting." She tells us very gently about the Doctor's "impotent and sometimes ridiculous logic," his "irreverent assumption of the Divine prerogatives," his "sentimental silliness," &c., &c. (p. 4). In the same page we are informed that "marriage became in his hands a base commercial transaction," because he would advise women to stay at home and mind their business, rather than gad about,—because he would have them attend domestic affairs in preference to the affairs of the nation.

In short, because the Doctor thought that making a pie or a pudding might be as useful as making a speech, he has "reduced women to the level of the beasts that perish" (*Ib.*). What a monster! At page 7, our author proceeds to inform us how it was that this dangerous matter was brought to her attention. "In late issues," she says, "of an able, if not the leading, religious newspaper in New England, appeared a series of articles from the pen of Dr. Todd, entitled 'Woman's Rights.'" Then the recommendation which they received from the editor is quoted; next we are informed that "an able, if not the leading secular newspaper of New England," was so ungallant and stupid as to praise the same matter as soon as it appeared in book form, saying that it is "full of good, strong common-sense, which will commend it to the great majority of American women" (p. 8).

Whether this be true or not, it is certainly more than could be said of the book which purports to be a refutation of it. Dr. Todd wishes, it seems, to address himself to the sensible and modest portion of the sex; he desires to reason with them on the subject without making any claim to superiority,—a proposition which Gail Hamilton disposes of by quoting a line of elegant poetry (p. 14), which shows that her taste is nearly as good as her logic:

"Will you, will you, will you, will you walk in, Mr. Fly."

Dr. Todd is of opinion that the delicate organization of woman unfits

her for long-continued labour, even in those spheres for which it is claimed by the advocates of woman's rights they are best calculated. "Did you ever know a woman," he asks, "who could endure being a teacher till seventy-five, as men often do," &c. The reply of Gail Hamilton to this is that men "*might, in some cases, till seventy-five thousand,*" for all the fatigue their teaching need cause them" (p. 20).

Dr. Todd tells the ladies that if they take off their robes, put on pants and run about unbidden to do the work of men, they cannot be good wives and mothers, &c. All this Gail Hamilton "refutes" after the following fashion: "During the late war was there not an army of women at home as large as the army of men in the field, and did they not work as long and as efficiently?" (p. 33). Those who went to the war, however, were the best types of womanhood; accordingly we have long and glowing accounts of some of them in "Woman's Wrongs." What a splendid specimen of the sex was Mrs. Bickerdyke, for example? quite a goodly number of pages are devoted to her achievements. Gail tells us that this lady was called the mother of a regiment, if not of a whole brigade (p. 191 *et seq.*). No doubt she deserved the title; but it is to be feared that some patriotic Amazons are as much the wife as the mother of the regiment. Gail admits that, exemplary as Mother Bickerdyke was, there were surgeons who "cursed her and clamoured for her removal" (p. 192). True, they were not the right kind of surgeons who did this, but the faithless and ignorant. Those of the opposite character could not have done without her. Among the womanly exploits of Mrs. Bickerdyke which Gail Hamilton calls upon us to admire, is the following (it is only necessary for the reader to bear in mind that a "sanitary shirt" had been appropriated by one not entitled to it, and that the good mother detected the culprit):—

"'Where did you get that shirt?' she said, fiercely. 'It's none of your business,' he answered. 'I'll see if it isn't,' she replied; and seizing it, as he had no coat on, she drew it over the head of the unfortunate wight, stunned into silence. 'Now let me see your feet,' said she, stooping and taking one in her hand. Off came the socks and slippers in a twinkling, to the infinite delight of the patients. The denuded thief slunk off suddenly, a sadder and a wiser man, and Mrs. B. had no further trouble in this hospital concerning sanitary stores."—pp. 193-4.

This was a model woman. She did not permit herself to be hampered by any conventionalities; she did what she liked, and what she disliked she did not do, no matter who asked her; or if she obliged anybody it was somebody who had no claim upon her. "I should like to see Dr. Todd tiptoeing up to Mother Bickerdyke," says our author "and telling her that her happiness consisted in her dependence as wife, mother, and daughter" (p. 197). Probably she would give him a fist or a kick, or draw his shirt over his head! ¶

Now one of the worst wrongs of women, be it remembered, is that they are not permitted by their tyrannical husbands or fathers to per-

form such exploits as those of Mrs. Bickerdyke. It is bad enough, Gail thinks, that women are not generally allowed to compete with men in obtaining situations, but even, when they succeed sometimes in getting into a handsome position, they get little more than half the salary the men get. There is no doubt that there are men who take an advantage of them in this way, but it is equally true that there are others who pay them not only as much as they pay men, but more. Nay, not unfrequently work furnished by women is accepted and paid for without a murmur, which, if furnished by men, would have been rejected without hesitation. Indeed, we strongly suspect that if the volume before us had been presented to Ticknor & Fields as the performance of one wearing pantaloons, together with beard, mustaches, &c., it would have been declined, though very politely, before the sixth page was read—not a line of it would have been printed; although, of course, this would have been a serious loss to womankind.

Dr. Todd remarks, in substance, that since there are seventy-five thousand more women than men in New England, it is not to be expected that all the former could find employment in positions usually occupied by the latter, seeing that not a few of the men themselves are out of employment; still less is it to be expected, he says, that these seventy-five thousand women could get as good salaries as the men, of whom there is a comparative scarcity. Political economists tell us that whatever glut the market must be more or less cheap; nor are strong-minded women exempt from the operation of this law. But Gail Hamilton disposes of it in her usual elegant and convincing style. "The seventy thousand women," she says, "may sit on the curbstone and *suck their thumbs* for any thing he has to suggest," &c. (p. 59). If this handsome brigade were only allowed to vote, all might be right; from this it follows, as a matter of course, that to prevent them is a most iniquitous thing. Gail proves the fact in her usual happy way. "Are American women, *as a class*," she asks, "more unfit to vote than Irishmen? Are they less capable of understanding issues involved, and of passing judgment upon measures proposed, than negroes who have been slaves for generations?" (p. 87). This settles the point. Everybody knows that Irishmen are unfit to vote; some think that negroes are somewhat unfit also; but both races are occasionally permitted to vote; *ergo* the fitness of women is demonstrated!

Dr. Todd thinks that the young women of the present day are forced to study too much, since, in addition to ordinary branches, they have to study chemistry, botany, astronomy, rhetoric, natural and moral philosophy, metaphysics, French, often German, Latin, perhaps Greek, &c., &c. (p. 53). But Gail Hamilton sees no difficulty in all this. "I affirm," she says, "that if, between the ages of six and eighteen, a girl cannot *get all those things* she is a *poor thing*," (p. 58). Kepler, Newton, and Bacon, as well as Aristotle and Plato, have confessed themselves

ignorant of many things. We believe the most learned men of the present day admit also that there are some things which they do not understand. But a modern school-girl who does not know every thing is "a poor thing," according to our author. In La Fontaine's time to learn Hebrew, the sciences, and history, was regarded as an effort somewhat similar to drinking up the sea.

"Si j'apprenois l'Hebreu, les sciences, l'histoire,
Tout cela, c'est la mer à boire."

But this would be only children's play in this enlightened age and country. As for Gail Hamilton, her learning must be unbounded. Nothing is hidden from her that is within the reach of human ken. It is true that this might not be inferred from her style at a casual glance; but a closer examination would readily reveal its classic polish. What can be finer, for example, than the taste she displays, and so unostentatiously, in those quotations, which she has always at hand to give the *coup de grace* to an impertinent argument? We need only point out one or two instances to satisfy the most stupid or most skeptical, how full of refinement she is in this respect. We doubt whether any logician, but herself, would have hit on the following beautiful lines as a refutation of all the arguments brought against female suffrage (p. 74):—

"I do not like you, Dr. Fell.
The reason why I cannot tell," &c.

It is superfluous for us to transcribe the whole quotation, since every reader of taste must be acquainted with that fine *morceau*. Still more classical, and apposite, perhaps, is the couplet:—

"Owen Moore has run away,
Owing more than he can pay."

We trust we shall never again have the disagreeable task of criticising a book of this kind from the pen of Gail Hamilton. We can assure the lady that we should much rather speak of her efforts in the language of approbation than in that of censure. As already intimated, we do not doubt that she can write very interesting magazine stories; but her philosophy is 'a spurious article; and were her "Woman's Rights" ethics adopted, we might regard modesty and delicacy—those charms of the sex which fascinate us most—as virtually discarded. But, fortunately, there is no danger. It would take far sounder logic than Gail is capable of to induce any sensible woman to accept her theories—indeed, no one would do so who was not rather prone to vagaries before a line of the present volume was written.

Highland Rambles. A Poem. By WILLIAM B. WRIGHT. 12mo, pp. 188.
Boston: Adams & Co. 1868.

We know neither the author nor the publishers of this little volume. It has reached our table without any heralding; not a word are we told

about it even in the form of a preface. A dedication, indeed, it has, but a peculiar one; it consists of two or three simple stanzas addressed to nobody in particular, except we regard Love as possessing flesh and bones. From this it might be inferred that the volume is all about love. There is love enough in it; but no excess; nothing mawkish. The author is evidently aware that even love may be made a drug by being thrust forward in all situations. The most beautiful and fascinating woman must not always talk in an amorous strain, if she would retain her hold on our affections. Love has a very wide reign, undoubtedly; but many other passions and feelings enter into the composition of human nature; and, accordingly, the poet who would be natural, must give those other passions and feelings their due proportions in his portraiture.

We should not have deemed it necessary to make any remark of this kind were it not so much the habit, at the present day, to exaggerate, *ad nauseam*, whatever is chosen as a subject, and admitted to be worthy of praise. "Poems" are constantly reaching us constructed on this plan; but none read them. The authors blame the public taste for this; they say poetry is slighted. The age, they complain, is too utilitarian; it has no admiration for the beautiful, only for the useful—what brings the dollar, or helps to get it in some way; whereas the truth is, that the sort of stuff alluded to is not poetry at all, but a kind of jargon which does not express the feelings or aspirations of either men or angels.

Now, it is precisely because the public is improving in its taste that it rejects such as this; and we hope it will continue to do so until our would-be Homers, Virgils, Dantes, and Miltons learn that something more than rhyme, or blank verse, sentimentalism, vulgar slang, or high-sounding bombast, vanity, and assurance is necessary to constitute poetry. We are so wearied of examining the "Poems" sent to our office, and finding after all our pains and loss of time that they are unworthy of the briefest notice, that, when any thing even tolerable falls into our hands, we are not only willing, but glad to do full justice to its merits. But "Highland Rambles" is not merely tolerable; the poem contains not a few noble passages. Many of its simplest strains are at once musical and elevated, and not unfrequently they have all the freshness as well as the Æolian plaintiveness of the Highland breeze when the voice of the pibroch recalls the deeds of other days.

But we must hasten to let the reader judge for himself, bearing in mind that no description, however elaborate or graphic, can give as accurate an idea of poetry as a specimen of itself. At the same time, we would not have the reader expect too much; we think it rather our duty to warn him that he must not expect to find every thing in "Highland Rambles" musical and beautiful, or even simply faultless, for our poet occasionally uses expressions which are neither poetical nor appropriate. In general, indeed, his verse lacks polish; but still more generally his

thoughts are striking; they are often original, and nearly always in sympathy with the true aspirations of humanity.

The poem opens with three young men "strayed spirits," Arthur, Vivian, and Paul, ready to start on a tour through the Highlands. But in order to prepare us for the scenes and incidents that await us, we are presented with some lively stanzas; even these, placed as they are in the vestibule, have truth and nature enough in them to give a foretaste of what we may expect when we reach the interior of the edifice, as one or two of them will show :—

Forth, and snap the cunning fetter;
Couched in Alpine bower,
Thou shalt have thy senses better
Where cool-fronted mountains tower.
Hearts of men, 'tis said, beat surer
In their lordly bosoms,
Simpler faiths spring, love flows purer,
Life comes out in fresher blossoms.—Page 9.

The spirit in which the three sallied forth is well described; at the same time we obtain a bird's-eye view of a beautiful and romantic landscape.

They glided over bosomed meads, where now
The merle and robin helped the lark to thrill
The brightening cope with pulses of sweet sound,
Shook from the tree-foil half its load of dews,
And won with shout and leap the shaggy spurs
Of the height, and wrestling with the steepness gained
The summit, as the first keen lance of the sun
Splintered upon its crest and turned in rout
The trembling vapors.—Page 11.

After the three had wandered about for some time admiring the Alpine beauties on every side, Paul sings a song which is not unworthy of the land of Campbell and Burns. He had but just finished the last stanza when a footstep was heard, on "a ledge that neighboured." This incident is well conceived, and turned to excellent account. The stranger is old, and he is treated with the respect which age should always receive when unaccompanied with vice or crime; we can only make room for a fragment of the description :—

Straightway all arose,
Startled to sudden reverence by one,
Noble in mien, though bowed beneath his years,
Leaning upon a gnarled staff he seemed
Some fragment of an antique world, a sage
Fit to have fostered kingliest hearts, and shown
Beauty and truth to a heroic age.—Page 14.

The old man welcomes the youths in a spirit which is in entire accordance with his character :—

'Tis mine to welcome, for meseems I read
A softer clime upon your cheeks, not masked
With our rude bronze, and in your eyes I find
Perplexed mirrors of unwonted scenes.—Page 15.

After he has related to them some of the results of his experience, and entertained them with reminiscences, Vivian proceeds to give an account of himself and his companions. This, too, it will be seen, is quite in character; Vivian speaks as an intelligent student who has been trained to think would be expected to do:—

Three half-blown pedants we,
New-fledged from Academic nests, not yet
Full masters of the wing. Some vacant months
We slip the Sisyphæan weight of books,
And sweep our thoughts of all scholastic dust
And esoteric breathings of the schools;
Bathing our souls in highland valleys, shade
And sunlight, treading with monastic feet
The sylvan aisles and loud oracular seats
Of nature.—Page 15.

These, however, are not fair specimens; the poet soars much higher; it is certain that he becomes more and more original and eloquent as he proceeds; and need we say that this is a proof of genius in itself. Further on the travellers engage in a lively good-humoured discussion on State affairs. Paul thinks that statesmen and philosophers may be expected to proceed from the woods in certain circumstances, forgetting that they are very scarce even in the capitals of cities; but for this he is duly criticised:—

But then

Arthur let loose his wonted fierce disdain:
"Miraculous statesmen these! Rare kings of men!
Fie, Paul, you lack acquaintance with the world.
Your eyes droop away, and you miss the thing
That woos you to observe it. Who would ride
The storm, must like the eagle first make strong
His wings by buffeting its thunder-breath.
Ha, ha, God help your sceptred anchorites.
Far wiser they to tend their cabbages,
To train the rose or list the robin pipe,
Than feed the popular dragon on the cates
Of delicate idealisms."

But the reader has yet seen nothing on love from a poem which is dedicated to Cupid. Very properly our poet is in no hurry to make his students fall in love, knowing that once in love it will not be easy to induce them to return to their studies; he is evidently aware that one who is fully smitten with the tender passion is not in a favourable frame of mind for enjoying even the romantic beauties of the Highlands. Sooner or later they must love, however; and accordingly the case of one is described as follows:—

Mounting they beheld,

Within a rose-plot, Edith, whose sweet smiles
Long since had thieved the passionate heart of Paul.
She propped a pale tube-rose whose fragile grace
Too eager winds had clasped; her piteous eye
Quickened the pulses in its stem, her breath
Doubled the ripening fragrance of the bud.

Oh, who could paint her as she seemed to him !
 Ah, to his eye the roses' wealth of hue
 Was shamed by that one rose upon her cheek.
 The spirit of the summer filled her eyes,
 Deep fountains of a mild and dewy light :
 Twin buds that sleep, half opened, cheek to cheek,
 Were those soft-glowing lips, and round her chin
 Gathered the subtly curving lines of grace
 That mould and plump a taper pear. He thought
 The lily-rose less graceful from its stalk
 Than from the snowy arching of her neck,
 The splendour of her head. But he not typed
 By other loveliness the mystic swell
 Of the rich bosom, musically heaved,
 Nor the sunlight of smiles that wont to haunt
 The sporting dimples of her faultless hand.—Pages 82, 83.

This, be it remembered, is but a small fragment of Edith's portrait ; she is described in full, and, with the exception of a harsh line and forced expression here and there, it must be admitted that the description is natural enough. As it is but fair we should point out the forms of expression to which we object, we will remark that Mr. Wright is rather partial to the word "thieve," "thieved," "typed," &c. We think it will be admitted that it is at least as poetical to "steal" the heart of maiden or swain, as to "thieve" it. Thief is rather an ugly name for a lover ; at least the term would imply illicit or dishonourable love ; but is there any thing illicit or dishonourable in "sweet smiles," and it was they we are informed that

Thieved the passionate heart of Paul.

But a few pages further on our author makes full amends for making thieves of Edith's bright and honest eyes. We are sure our lady readers will readily forgive him when they see how charmingly he describes the dawn of love in the following passage, with which we must conclude our extracts :—

Oh rose and matchless fragrance of all hours,
 When Love salutes us from a maiden's eyes,
 And magic instincts stir and the young heart
 Gushes in song ! Oh golden sum of all,
 When two clear billows on the sea of Beauty
 Moved upon diverse but systematic tides,
 Break to each other o'er the rocky bars
 Of personality, and, blending, bloom
 Upward in a white foam of spotless passion !
 Yet this is Love, the mystic elf, quick-born
 Upon the tremulous bosom of a sigh,
 A gleam, a glow, a fine and fitting pinion,
 A liquid rhyme or young Titania's dream.
 But lovers must aye purge their mortal selves,
 Making their breasts clear shrines of crystalline,
 That Beauty, from her lodge in either soul
 Peeping, may quickly know herself and yearn
 For that old oneness ere the man was framed.
 The lovers are the chosen, unto them
 The incommunicable is revealed.

We have thus devoted considerable space and time to this volume, not because it contains any thing very remarkable, but because we wish to encourage those who have a taste for poetry. If there were many poems, worthy of the name, produced in our time, "Highland Rambles," we might, perhaps, have laid aside, or we might have devoted a paragraph or two to a favourable word of it; but it is useless to set up a higher standard than can be reached, and condemn as worthless whatever falls short of that standard. We should all like to have a prime article; but if we cannot get the best, then we ought to make the most of the best we can get, if only in the hope of inducing others to make a step in advance. We do not agree with those who say that poetry is useless; it is only of the spurious article this can be said. Nothing that is pleasing, or that affords rational gratification is useless; nothing is useless that soothes us or that awakens in us generous sympathies; and that genuine poetry is capable of producing those influences, none capable of judging would for a moment deny. If Plato would not have a poet in his model republic, he did not value poetry the less on this account; a fact sufficiently proved by the pains he has taken to enable every intelligent person to enjoy it to the fullest extent.

The Mind of Francis de Sales. A Book of Religious Life. Translated from the Old Original French. By Mrs. NORTH PEAT. 16mo, pp. 274. New York: Genl. Prot. Episc. S. S. Union. 1868.

No believer in Christianity, let him belong to what sect he may, would deny that this little volume deserves a place in the family library. We do not pretend to be pious ourselves; but we hold genuine piety in high esteem, because we are sure that its influence is salutary. Nothing contributes more to human happiness than good thoughts; it is not alone Christians they act upon and improve; they affect all who think more or less. And this is particularly true of the thoughts of De Sales, which, from the power they have exercised throughout Christendom, are called his spirit or mind. It is pleasant to see a Protestant society of the present day recognizing the true worth of a Catholic bishop, who flourished more than three hundred years ago. This is as it ought to be; would that all sects were equally liberal, and equally consistent with their professions; we should not have nearly as many rival churches as there are chapters in the Bible.

De Sales would not thank any one for being gentle when none contradicted, offended, or irritated him. "Wild beasts," he says, "become tame when kindly treated" (p. 13). "If we are as we ought to be," he says, "we will be kind to the ill-tempered—even to those who calumniate and abuse us" (Ib.). He would also have us reply with politeness to offensive words; what is perhaps more difficult still, he would have us endure the refusal of a petition without displeasure (p. 18). We fear

there are not many who are equal to this; although much depends on the nature of the petition or request.

De Sales was too wise a man to recommend excessive ansterities. He thought strong, vigorous people might profit in their morals from occasional fasting; but that feeble, delicate people had better avoid it. "It is that," he says, "which strikes at the root of the tree; the others (referring to ansterities) only graze it, scratch the bark, or clear away a few excrescences. The body when poorly fed is more easily subdued; when abundantly nourished it kicks and rears" (p. 181). But he becomes more definite and explicit as he proceeds. "The spirit," he says, "faints beneath the weight of the body when the latter is *too gross*, and the body when it is *too weak* cannot bear the *spirit* in consequence of its weakness" (p. 182).

This is a very good criterion for those who are in doubt whether they should fast or not. We confess we are not among the number ourselves, for we never refuse a good, well-cooked beefsteak except when our appetite is defective. But we do not the less respect those who do fast on this account; we only hope they will agree with us that De Sales is right in thinking that fasting may sometimes degenerate into a species of suicide. Be this as it may, the little volume before us cannot be read without profit by the most careless.

EDUCATION.

Grand Annual Celebration of the Philodemic Society of Georgetown College. Pamphlet, pp. 72. Baltimore, 1868.

WE have great respect for Georgetown College, because it has done much good; for the same reason we respect and esteem the Jesuits as a body, whose institution it is. It is not their religion, however, or their peculiar dogmas that have inspired us with those feelings, although we have no fault to find with either, and have never found any. If their opinions, or faith, are not ours, we are not the less certain that if no worse influences, religious, moral, or political, than theirs were exercised on society, the world would not suffer much either from precept or example. Men who devote themselves to education have never done much mischief; probably none at all to society at large; for what sometimes seems evil to the narrow-minded and thoughtless has proved in the lapse of time to be positive good.

Thus fully do we recognize the prestige of the Jesuits as educators. But is a prestige to last forever? Supposing it does, will it continue to do the work that first won it? It will be admitted that if we employ a tutor to instruct our children, the question is not, Was his grandfather, or great-grandfather, a celebrated teacher, but, Is he a competent teacher himself? If he is not, would it not be carrying veneration and prestige

a little too far to give him the employment in compliment to his ancestors of one or two hundred years ago?

But does this apply to the Jesuits of the present day? Are there persons among us who send them their sons, not because they know them to be competent instructors, but because the Society once had, if it has not still, a great name? We fear that every candid person will have to answer this question in the affirmative. It is not to be expected that those who dispose of their children to-day, in accordance with what was done hundreds of years ago, would enquire very closely whether educational fraternities, which were not in existence when the Jesuits were famous throughout the world as educators, might not be quite as good, if not somewhat better, than those who assume the same name as the famous ones. No such idea occurs to them; with them the name is every thing. If there is any difference between an old lamp and a new lamp,—between the lamp of Aladdin and the lamp of Smith,—it is in favour of the latter, which has got the modern improvements. But while the class alluded to would thus give the preference to a new lamp, if allowed to choose, a candlestick or a chandelier would not suit them at all. Either, it is true, might answer the same purpose,—nay, be even better than the lamp,—show a more brilliant and more honest light. But the name is what they want; a lamp is a lamp, though it may emit but a flickering glare.

All this, however, does not impugn the qualifications of the Jesuits of the present day. They are not to blame if their labours are more highly estimated than those of some other fraternities, who do their work as intelligently and faithfully as they. But are the Jesuits in this country worthy of the ancient Society? A few years ago we thought they were; but changes have since taken place which have very considerably modified our opinion on that subject. Perhaps it is we that are wrong and the Jesuits right, for we do not pretend to be infallible; on the contrary, we admit that there are many things of which we are ignorant. At all events we do not alter our views without reasons which are satisfactory at least to ourselves; nor do we want to conceal those reasons from our readers, since they are of no value to us any further than they are true; and the truth is just what we are seeking in the present case.

Well, some four or five years ago we found two Jesuit colleges in this country in a flourishing condition. Georgetown College was one of these; the other was the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. No similar institutions belonging to any denomination were doing their work more thoroughly, nor did we hesitate to bear testimony to the fact. But at this time we were not aware that some Provincials of the Society remove men of capacity from the charge of their colleges, in order to make room for men of no capacity. It is true that men of very small capacity were in charge at the same time of two Jesuit colleges not far from New York, but we thought they were placed there only by

accident, and that as soon as better could be procured, they would get leave of absence. Accordingly, one or two were sent to some remote part, and more capable men, or rather less incapable men, were put in their places. This, although not all that could be desired, was an improvement, and we accepted it as such; we inferred from it that when presidents or rectors of Jesuit colleges were removed, more competent men were put in their places. Yet we confess we did not think very highly of the judgment of our New York Provincial; we thought that if he did not lack some essential qualification he could easily have selected better rectors. Still, as we have said, he improved somewhat on the old, and is, therefore, entitled to the credit of making some progress, however little.

But the Provincial having charge of Georgetown and Holy Cross, pursues exactly the opposite course; he removes men whose superior capacities are acknowledged by all—men of comprehensive minds and enlarged views, and puts men of narrow minds and contracted views in their place. We have really no unkind feeling towards either of the new rectors; we would not do either the slightest injury if it were in our power. Nor have we the least doubt that they are men of blameless lives, and excellent clergymen. It is only as parts of a system that we speak of them in the present instance; without the slightest ill-will towards anybody, we are obliged to regard them as obstructions to the great cause of education, in behalf of which the Society has gained so much well-merited renown.

It is true that the southern Provincial has sought to make amends to some extent for each of the blunders which he committed; and for this we are willing to give him due credit. Finding, when it is a little too late, that it was not well to remove a well tried, highly respected and eminently successful rector, and make room for a gentleman of slender experience and still more slender abilities, as an instructor, although strictly upright and well-meaning—he makes the deposed President a Vice-President. This would be very well if a Jesuit Vice-President was not merely the shadow of the President; the latter is the ruling power, to whom the former has to render the most implicit obedience in all things.

The Provincial seeks to remedy the second *faux pas* by giving the second displaced President of a first-class college charge of a fifth-rate college, or school, and then, after a little further reflection, giving the same gentleman charge of a third-rate college. This is probably the best that could have been done under the circumstances; all are liable to err, and accordingly, we have no disposition to speak either hastily or disrespectfully of the Provincial. We are only sorry, for the sake of the great cause of education, that, if it was necessary to make changes, other men were not placed in charge of Georgetown and Holy Cross respectively. We could ourselves mention half a dozen, any two of whom would have made rectors to whom none could object. We forbear doing so, how-

ever, lest we might be the cause of bringing trouble on gentlemen who are in no manner responsible for our opinions, further than that their scholarship and educational abilities impressed us highly when we had the privilege of being present at some of their ordinary lectures to their classes.

But it is not alone the best presidents who are removed about in this way; the best professors are removed in a similar manner; so that in the course of two years nearly the entire faculty are new men to the students. Who will pretend that this is right? Will it be asserted by the merest tyro in teaching or learning, that students will learn as much from strangers, whom they had never heard of until they took charge of their class, as they would have learned from those under whose tuition they had spent a year or two of their course, in whose abilities they had confidence, and whose friendly and conscientious zeal for their improvement had secured their attachment and esteem?

The contrary is well known to every intelligent person. But let any one look at the faculty of Georgetown College, or Holy Cross College, as officially published to-day, and compare it with the faculty of only two or three years ago. How many of the old remain? If we are right in our calculation, not one-fifth. The rest, generally the best, are scattered to the four points of the compass. In short, the Georgetown, or the Holy Cross, of to-day, is nearly as different from the Georgetown or the Holy Cross of three years ago, in all things save the buildings, the grounds, and the name, as almost any two colleges in the country are from each other.

It is idle, then, for our American Jesuit colleges to call themselves *Alma Mater*. Even in Mahometan countries, children do not get a new mother every two or three years; or if they do, they call them step-mothers. The name *Alma Mater* is therefore much more appropriate than *Alma Mater*, under the circumstances indicated, although it must be admitted that a *noverca* is seldom *alma*. At the same time, we do not attribute any harshness to the new faculty more than to the old, or any disposition on the part of the present mother, or step-mother, to give an over-dose of paragon. We are only speaking now of what we consider the very unfavourable moral influence of those changes, altogether independently of the literary qualifications and intellectual abilities of the professors.

Nor is there any thing in the *brochure* before us, considered as a whole, which conflicts in the slightest degree with our views; on the contrary, we think it goes far to confirm those views. By this we do not mean, however, but it is a respectable, intelligent publication; one which would do no discredit to any college. We should be neither fair nor just did we attempt to disparage the efforts of the Philodemic Society; we should be wanting in principle as well as in candour, did we permit ourselves to sneer at the celebration of a society which has done so much

good, and whose elevating influence is by no means confined to the students of the college. But had its character been different, our respect and esteem for its Rev. President would have protected it from any strictures on our part, knowing, as we should, from experience, that if it had faults they would soon disappear, or at least be much diminished, under the auspices of that judicious and accomplished educator.

The *brochure* gives a very graphic account of the celebration, copied from the *Baltimore Mirror*—a journal that does honour to the Catholic press in this country by the decided ability and liberal, cosmopolitan spirit with which it is conducted. Our respect for the *Mirror* is so great that we feel sincere regret when we criticise those whom it commends, or around whom it casts its friendly and genial mantle. But our business is to review and to point out, as best we can, the difference between gold and mere tinsel. If we are not capable of the task, then any one who chooses is quite welcome to criticise us as freely as he likes. We certainly do not mean, however, to call the poem on "Peace" either tinsel or pot-metal; on the contrary, we regard it as a genuine effort of the lyric muse, and consequently we are not at all surprised at the fervidness of the *Mirror* in telling us that "the opening lines, pronounced by the sonorous voice of the author, stirred as the sound of a trumpet; and the true poetic fire which showed throughout the piece warmed up the attention during the entire half hour of its delivery" (p. 51).

The historical sketch of Georgetown College is also worth reading. It will be admitted by all who are acquainted with the institution, that no tribute was ever better deserved than that contained in the following sentence:—

"The close of President Early's career was blessed by a return of the same prosperity which marked its opening, and after a term of more than seven years, during which he conducted the College with success through a period of severe and unexampled difficulty, he retired, January 1st, 1866, to give place, for a second time, to Rev. B. A. Maguire" (p. 16).

We think that the closing line of this sentence was not submitted to the Very Rev. Provincial for his approbation. But what will be said of the sentence which immediately follows it?

"The term of the present incumbent has already been marked, not only by a great accession to the number of students, but by many *material* improvements. Chief among these are the very considerable enlargement of the *play-grounds*, the *embellishment of the towers*, and the general renovation of the College buildings" (p. 17).

This is rather severe on the "present incumbent." Is there no law in Georgetown against mocking one's superiors; or showing them up as violators of the *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*? We confess we did not suppose that our present rector was doing much good; still we had not so low an opinion of him as to think that he occupied himself chiefly with the play-grounds, although we might have inferred as much from

his sympathy for the billiard players of Fordham, and his indignation against those who had the assurance to object to the introduction into a pious Christian College of what even the Pagans ranked with adultery, intoxication, &c.*

The embellishment of the towers is no doubt a very meritorious thing; if one cannot put any thing nourishing in the platter, let him at least burnish it up on the *outside*! When members of Congress run down and see those enlarged play-grounds and embellished towers, "What a splendid institution!" they will exclaim. The Hon. John Morrissey, for example, will be in ecstasies. As we understand that that gentleman has lately been studying French, we should not be surprised to hear him address the reverend renovator in the language of Monsieur Jourdain: "*Ah! l'habile homme que vous êtes, et que j'ai perdu de temps!*" Since the generosity of our representative, is equal to his well known love of "science," we should not at all be surprised if on seeing the high estimation in which "play" is held at Georgetown under its present auspices, he would present the institution with one of his celebrated faro banks, with all the paraphernalia appertaining thereto. As to the towers, we think it would be as safe to have a little of the rust on them; if they were too much "embellished" Butler might take them to be heaps of silver plate, and demolish them altogether.

Now, it seems to us that in their palmiest days the Jesuits would have destroyed their prestige by devoting their chief attention to the enlargement of play-grounds and the embellishment of towers. Had they not occupied their thoughts with much nobler objects, and sought the attainment of those objects by persevering, unwearied, intellectual effort, their name would have been of little value to their successors of the present day. It was not *show* or *display* the Jesuits who gained a reputation for the Society cared for; on the contrary, it was the very thing they shunned. Their pride was to influence the world, not through its weaknesses or its vices, but through its intellect. The power on which they depended, and which they used with such wonderful effect in all parts of the world, was knowledge. This was their instrument, not the billiard-table, the chess-board, or any other gaming apparatus or play-things. Those who use the latter are, in fact, but Jesuits in name; let them assume what airs they may, they are a degenerate race.

Not, we repeat, but there are as good men in the Society now as there ever were; but what can they do when they are thrust into the back-ground, and forced to render implicit obedience to those who have not the understanding to command? In short, an entire reformation of the government of the Society, at least in this country, is needed. If the General of the Order will only take a trip to this country and visit the different colleges, we have not the least doubt that he will say we are

* Vide Juvenal, Sat. xi. passim.

right. It will be only necessary for him to look at the heads of our present rectors. We are no believers in the bump system, but we know that very small heads have generally very small brains, and that no length of stature, however great, can compensate for a deficiency of the *thinking apparatus*.

1. *Principia Latina*.—Part I. A First Latin Course.
2. *Principia Latina*.—Part II. A First Latin Reading Book. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D., author of "A History of Greece," "A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," &c., &c. Revised by H. Dresler, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.

THESE two volumes are admirably calculated to encourage the beginner in the study of Latin; and in no elementary books that we have seen in this country, are the principles of the language more fully explained, or more attractively illustrated. Part I. embraces "grammar, delectus, and exercise book, with vocabularies." Part II. contains an epitome of Cæsar's Gallic wars, and Lhomond's Lives of Distinguished Romans, together with an introduction to Roman Antiquities, and a dictionary embracing all the Latin words given in the exercises.

We have examined both parts very carefully, and we feel convinced that any intelligent instructor, who takes the same pains, will not hesitate to bear testimony to their excellence. Dr. Smith is a veteran compiler of text-books. Certainly no Englishman, or American, has done more to simplify the study of the classic languages than he; no one has afforded the student more intelligent and efficient aid, as all will acknowledge who are acquainted with his "Classical Dictionary," and "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," which are justly recognized wherever the English language is spoken, as standard works of reference. We confess we regard it as somewhat ominous.

That Professor Dresler, of Columbia College, places his name with his full title, on the title-page of each volume, as having "revised" it. Now the simple truth is, that neither needed his revising; and we are by no means sure that if it had, he was capable of doing it in a satisfactory manner. If he goes no further than this, however, there need be no complaint; we only fear from what others have done, that when a new edition is needed the Professor will attempt a little more revising, and then call the whole series "*Dresler's Principia Latina*." It might well seem that this is a groundless apprehension, and we hope it may prove such; but have not both Smith's admirable Dictionaries been appropriated by "revisers" belonging to the same college? It is true that the works alluded to are nothing the worse on this account; but why deprive a scholar of the honour of valuable and onerous labours, to which he devoted a large portion of his life? If one ought to bestow his own name on the works of another author, because he has added to them

some notes, an appendix, &c., then "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" ought to be called Gibbon's no longer, but Guizot's or Milman's.

If these were ordinary text-books we should have no fear of their being appropriated; nor, indeed, should we care whether they were or not. But as they are the result of much labour, thought and skill, and are calculated to render a somewhat thorny path smooth and even attractive, we protest thus early, but *sine malificio*, against their being appropriated.

SCIENCE.

Address of Members of the Chamber of Commerce of Geneva, and a number of Citizens, to the Congress of the United States of America, and the Chambers of Commerce of their sister Republic. Geneva, March, 1868.

It is seldom that any public document has afforded us so much gratification as this Address, for we confess that we feel some pride in finding the views which we have advocated for nearly twenty years corroborated by the testimony of those, who, from their experience, intelligence, and impartiality, are, above all others, best calculated to form a correct opinion on the subject of those views. The Chamber of Commerce of Geneva has a peculiar character; seldom are more than one-third of its members Swiss; the remaining two-thirds consist of eminent merchants of France, Germany, Italy, and England, who have established houses at Geneva, partly because that city is favourably situated for certain kinds of trade, and partly because they prefer republicanism to monarchy. This cosmopolitan feature of the Chamber gives it a prestige throughout Europe; a fact sufficiently evident from the estimation in which its views are held by the most eminent political economists.

But the document now before us does not emanate merely from the Chamber of Commerce; it does not exclusively embrace the French, German, Italian, and English commercial experiences combined in that body but also includes the impressions of many private citizens, including authors and editors. It will be admitted that, under any circumstances, a friendly address from a body of this character should receive respectful attention; but, in this case, they address Congress on the subject which, above all others, they best understand; and they do so without the slightest tinge of selfishness, except so far as the wish to promulgate truth and expose error may deserve that name.

Nor is there any thing dictatorial in the Geneva Address: those who present it do not speak as instructors; they do not assume to be more learned, or more wise than ourselves. But seeing that a large proportion of our representatives in Congress regard paper money not only

as a safe and good currency, but as equal to gold or silver, if not better than either of the precious metals, they offer us the results of long experience, to show that this is a dangerous fallacy; in other words, finding that our Secretary of the Treasury is desirous of restoring specie payments, and that he is opposed to any further issue of paper money while perhaps a majority in Congress think paper is as good as gold as a circulating medium, they beg leave as friends to bear testimony that our Secretary is right, and that, for the sake of the nation, Congress ought to sustain him.

The Address contains nothing that is new to the editor of this journal: it does not condemn paper money in more unqualified terms than we have always condemned it ourselves; although when it was, absolutely necessary to adopt it temporarily, far from opposing it, we, showed that the greatest and wealthiest nations have had recourse to paper money in similar emergencies.* Our view of paper money, as compared to gold has always been equivalent to this: if one may try to content himself in a hovel or "shanty" for a few months, or even years, in war times, that is no reason why he should always continue to prefer it to a fine marble, brown-stone, or even plain brick residence. Let no one think that this exaggerates the difference between paper money and gold. The individual might lose nothing by living awhile in a hovel. He would not be so comfortable, it is true, as in a marble or brown-stone house, suitably furnished; but the nation is always losing by its paper money. The latter is at once very expensive and very shabby. In short, the hut, or the "shanty," is a more honest piece of property; has more genuineness in it, than ten times what it would cost in paper money.

Because Secretary McCulloch has fully illustrated these principles we have sought to give him credit for the persevering, honest efforts which he has made to induce Congress to consult the interests of the country in its legislation on the currency. Neither the Chamber of Commerce of Geneva nor that of any other city in Europe or America had the priority of us in appreciating the broad, statesmanlike views of Mr. McCulloch on the subject of currency. His very first annual report, combined with the manner in which he managed the finances of the country during that year, satisfied us that Mr. Lincoln had done no wiser or better thing for the country, next to putting down the rebellion, than to place the Treasury in such able hands; nor did we hesitate to say so, as our readers will remember.

We did not regard the views of Mr. Chase on currency as by any means sound. Still, as his course was perhaps as good as could have been pursued during the war, we uttered not a word against it. But

* Vide National Quarterly Review, No. X., September, 1862, Article, "Effects of War and Speculation on Currency."

seeing that the war was crushed, if not quite over, our first care was to collect the reports and other financial documents of Mr. Chase with the view of exposing the fallacy and danger of his whole system; but when we had nearly performed all the labour a new Secretary had been appointed. Having no desire to indulge in criticisms on Mr. Chase, after his elevation to the Supreme Bench, we threw our manuscript aside, and hence it is that no "attack" upon his management of our finances has ever appeared in this journal.

We allude to this fact now only because we learn that Mr. Chase has changed his views on the subject of the currency. If we are correctly informed—which we have no reason to doubt—he now fully approves the policy of Mr. McCulloch; and we think this is as highly complimentary to the latter as even the address to Congress of the merchants and political economists of Geneva, in which Secretary McCulloch receives such high and well merited praise. It will be admitted that, next to our present Secretary, no one has more thoroughly studied our financial system than Mr. Chase. Now, if the latter is in favour of specie payments, and thinks that the sooner we discard our paper money the better, it must be held that all our greatest statesmen concur as to the pernicious influence of paper money; for, be it remembered, that in our number for December, 1867, we showed that our great men of all parties were equally emphatic in condemning it, giving quotations from one of the annual messages of President Buchanan, and from one of the great speeches in Congress of Daniel Webster, in illustration of the views of those distinguished men.*

We now proceed to present our readers some extracts from the Geneva Address. It will perhaps appear somewhat remarkable that the views on currency expressed in those extracts are precisely those which we have expressed ourselves in these pages on several occasions; but more particularly in our last December article. That we have borrowed nothing from the Geneva Address, however, will be sufficiently evident from the act that the latter was written just three months after the publication of our article. At the same time we readily acquit the merchants and political economists of Geneva of having borrowed from our paper. They have embodied the same principles and views in their Address, because political economy is a veritable science—because on the same day, or on different days, months apart, the problem of currency—what is the difference between a paper currency, and a gold, or silver currency, could be solved nearly in the same words by a half-dozen persons, in as many cities of Europe and America, the same as any number of persons understanding geometry may prove in nearly the same language that the square described on the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is

* Vide No. XXXI; Article, "Management of our Finances; and its Influence of Paper Money."

equal to the sum of the squares described on the base and perpendicular.

The following brief note addressed to Mr. McCulloch accompanies the address:—

"GENEVA, March 26th, 1868.

"SIR:—We have the honour, as instructed by the body of whom we are a Committee to send you the enclosed address, and we are happy in the belief, induced by our knowledge of your administration of the vast financial interests of your country, that it embodies, essentially, the views which you entertain."

After assuring Congress of the admiration with which they witnessed our "heroic efforts" in putting down the war, and our "energetic perseverance applied to the realization of an entirely moral interest, namely: the prohibition of Slavery," &c., the authors of the Address proceed as follows:—

"Unfortunately, the deep wounds given to your prosperity by this struggle have not been healed so promptly as we hoped.

"The one first to be named and most pernicious, is the adoption of a paper currency, which continues its mischiefs.

"This might have been, in the beginning, of imperious necessity; but, by its continuation, it becomes a wide-spread calamity; it is a bleeding wound, always open, which we implore you to heal, the sooner the better. The prosperity of the whole commercial world is intimately bound up with the prosperity of your great country."

It will be admitted that there could be no more emphatic condemnation of paper currency than this, yet we cannot say that the evil is in the least exaggerated. It is a "bleeding wound, always open," and they are certainly our friends who implore us to heal it. The Address then proceeds to show the spirit of amity and sympathy in which Congress is thus earnestly appealed to.

"We (Swiss) are strongly associated with your prosperity; by the decrease as well as by the development of, the international exchanges, and even more with every thing that interests you, by the conformity of our political institutions and by the blessings of liberty, which both nations enjoy in the highest degree.

"Allow us on the strength of this brotherhood of moral as well as of material import, to speak to you of those interests concerning you, as we understand them. We saw at the time, with the greatest pleasure, the measures which authorized your Secretary of the Treasury, to withdraw every month a certain amount of Greenbacks; but we noticed with deep regret, that after the repeal of that faculty, the question has been raised of a new emission of 140 millions of dollars of paper currency, destined to replace this very amount which had been withdrawn."

All who are really interested in our welfare and are capable of understanding the subject, could view any such increase of our paper money only with regret. Our Geneva friends next proceed to compare gold and silver to paper as a circulating medium.

"Gold and silver, in the shape of money, are the most energetic agents to prompt industrial and commercial activity; that is to say—labour! on its development rests the development of humanity.

"To keep in circulation a paper currency, which takes the place of gold and silver in its most important functions, at the same time that the productions of the gold mines are abundant, is an anomaly which shocks reason, and which appears almost ungrateful to the blessings of Providence.

"The emission of paper money by any government is nothing else than a *heavy tax on the public*; a tax which strikes at hazard, and falls heaviest on those least able to bear it; the evil it produces goes on increasing from day to day, and the longer it lasts the more disastrous are its consequences.

"The depreciation of a paper currency imposed by government can only be compared to the alteration of coin, equal in its results to those acts, committed by despots of antiquity and of the middle ages, when they diminished the standard or the weight without changing the legal value."

There is not one of these facts which we have not put forward time after time in this journal; there is not one of them which is not placed in relief in our last December article. And the same is true of the following:—"What are the consequences of the creation of a paper currency, in regard to the justice, morality, and prospects of a people—paper currency arbitrarily imposed by a state? It is an iniquitous tax put on the creditor to the profit of the debtor." We have also anticipated the Geneva Address, in showing that the people, unaware of these corrupting influences, is always the victim. But we must give one extract more from the Address. After pointing out most of the evil consequences of paper money, it appeals directly to the good sense, self-respect, and patriotism of the American people.

"The sovereign people of the United States is the master of its destiny; *how is it that it tolerates this smarting wound, of which it would be an easy thing to rid itself?* By what *artful seductions* have certain interested men been able to make the people believe that it is to their advantage to have a superabundance of *fictitious money*, which drives from the country the money which has a real value; and makes it flow to Europe and elsewhere where it is over-abundant?"

"Brethren of the United States! pray hear us! Believe in the experience of an old republican people, who have *never tolerated* the existence of any kind of paper money, whilst, at various times, great powers of their neighbourhood have used these means to fill their empty coffers, but the result has invariably been *bankruptcy!* Pursue the road entered into so successfully by your able Secretary of the Finances, and take care not to tolerate new emissions of Greenbacks or any kind of paper money."

The most intelligent of the merchants of New York fully participate in the sentiments of the Geneva Address, in regard to Mr. McCulloch; and we do not think there is one of that class, no matter to what party he belongs, who does not regard Mr. Van Dyck, his representative in this city, as emphatically the best Sub-Treasurer we have ever had.

Among those who signed the Address from which the above extracts are taken are several authors, lawyers, and editors, including Merle d'Aubigné, author of "History of the Reformation." At the time it was presented to Congress that honourable body was not in a proper frame of mind to treat it with that attention and deference to which its importance entitles it; but now that it has had some time for reflection, impeachment having failed, we are glad to see that it seems more favourable to the resumption of specie payments, than to the issue of additional millions of paper money. Should it act accordingly, as it is to be hoped, for the good of the country, it will, Secretary McCulloch may justly congratulate himself on having gained greater moral triumphs than any financial minister of modern times.

A Treatise on Meteorology, with a Collection of Meteorological Tables.
By ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D., Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in Yale College. 8vo, pp. 305. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.

PROF. LOOMIS gives his book a modest title. We should like to see many follow his example in this respect; for the prevailing habit in our country, at the present day, is to make a "sensation" advertisement of the title-page. This is in bad taste; worthy only of boys, from whom exaggeration must be expected until they have undergone a proper course of discipline, and are taught to expect that every tendency to "flourish," or bombast must have a blot set on it.

Meteorology is familiarly and lucidly treated in the "Treatise." The most sanguine will not be disappointed at the amount of interesting and instructive facts which the professor has compressed into this volume; otherwise they are in the habit of seeing very different works on the subject from those issued in this country in recent years. Indeed, had our author confined himself to the treatises on Meteorology in the English language, his work would have been meagre enough; for it is one of those sciences which has been but little cultivated in England; and what is neglected in England is very apt to be neglected in America.

The French and Germans are the best meteorologists, and Prof. Loomis has availed himself, to a greater or less extent, of their best works. In our opinion, he has exercised a judicious discrimination in collecting his materials from so many sources. At the same time his treatise is by no means complete; but it is sufficiently so as a text-book for schools, or a work of reference for the ordinary family library; and for the benefit of those desiring a more thorough knowledge of meteorology, a long list of French, German, and English treatises and memoirs is given at the end of the work. The "Treatise" has the advantage of a full alphabetical index; it is also illustrated. If all our school-books were so legibly printed, much fewer of our children, of both sexes, would labour under affections of the eyes than are now suffering from the effects of bad typography and cheap paper.

HISTORY AND TRAVELS.

The Old World in its New Face. Impressions of Europe in 1867-8. By HENRY W. BELLOWS. Vol. I., pp. 454. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.

ALMOST everybody who goes to Europe at the present day wants to favour the world with his opinions on every thing he sees and hears. So many have been disappointed by books of travels, manufactured in accordance with this feeling, that the public has begun to regard all such

performances as of doubtful value. Nor can we say that it is wrong in this. A large number of those works are mere catch-pennies; although considerably more of the writers are actuated by vanity than the love of gain. Indeed, the majority understand very well that few will care to buy their productions—scarcely as many as would pay for the binding and ink, not to mention paper or printing. But “a book’s a book, although there’s nothing in it.” To be an author is a great thing, especially the author of a book of travels, in which one can puff his friends and give a bit of his mind about his enemies. What if so agreeable an amusement costs a few thousand dollars, including the privilege of sending an indefinite number of copies to dead-heads? It is a mere bagatelle in view of all the honour and renown which it is supposed to bring.

But we need hardly say that we do not rank the work before us among this class. Dr. Bellows is an experienced writer and an original thinker; and it is seldom, if ever, that any thing emanates from writers of this character which is not worth reading. Certainly, “The Old World in its New Face” does not form an exception. It is not our habit to indulge in superlatives in praise of any book, but we cannot say less, in general terms, of the present volume, than that it is entertaining and attractive. We have ourselves visited most of the cities from which Dr. Bellows’s letters are dated, and although we do not agree with him on all points, we cheerfully admit that even where, in our opinion, he errs most egregiously, he still succeeds in investing the topics he chooses with more or less interest. He is thoughtful and liberal; nor shall we fail to give him full credit, as we proceed, for his good intentions.

At the same time we shall take the liberty of noting certain little vanities and inconsistencies which strike us as somewhat amusing. They will, doubtless, be found useful, too, as affording some new illustrations of the fact that a doctor of divinity may sometimes blunder as much as mortals of the unsanctified herd like ourselves. Our readers are aware that some curious treatises have been written with the view of discovering what were the private views on religion and morality of certain great thinkers. Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Shakespeare have formed the subjects of many such, but the matter is still in doubt in each case. But no disquisition of the kind need be written on the author of the volume before us. The Rev. Dr. Bellows issues forth on his tour quite as fully labelled as the Knight of La Mancha or Sir Hudibras. The most careless reader is not permitted to lose sight of the fact, from the beginning to the end of the volume, that the author is the great American representative and exponent of “Liberal Christianity.” In this capacity, he passes judgment on all sects and denominations, and very much in the spirit of the honest carrier in the fable of the town which was in danger of being besieged. The carpenter thought that oak would be just the thing to keep out the enemy; the mason argued, with some show of reason, that granite would be a

safer protection. "Gentlemen," said the currier, "you may do as you like; but if you wish to have the town well defended and put out of all danger, there is nothing like leather."

The great panacea of Dr. Bellows is "Liberal Christianity,"—that is, the Unitarian faith, as preached in New York. Every other system is good, bad, or indifferent, according as it approaches or diverges from this. Ordinary Protestantism is dead throughout Continental Europe; Popery is still more defunct, if it is possible for one death to be more complete than another. Accordingly, the only hope of Europe is in "Liberal Christianity." True, they have something similar in parts of Germany, but it is not the genuine article. The "liberal" ministers of Europe are very excellent people in their way; they mean well, doubtless, but they have much to learn before they can pretend to equal their American brethren. It seems that lately some of them have been reading the "Christian Examiner" very attentively. This is very well, the Doctor thinks, as far as it goes; but the study of that valuable periodical must become general among the brethren throughout Germany before they can be considered out of danger.

We do not mean that these are the words used by Dr. Bellows; but if his constantly recurring remarks on the subject do not mean this, we cannot pretend to say what they do mean. We shall, however, let our author speak for himself, in order that the reader may form his own opinion. But let us first hear him on more agreeable topics. Whenever Dr. Bellows dismounts from his hobby, and speaks as a traveller who has no mission to fulfil, he is generally accurate as well as fair and liberal in his views. His description of Paris is one of the best we have seen for some time. The following passage will serve as a specimen, and prove interesting at the same time:—

"Paris, over whose principal streets and parks we have been continually wandering since we arrived, is one great spectacle of architectural vastness, splendour, taste, and finish, where magnitude, costliness, arrangement, and effect combine to surprise and delight the eye. The city is laid out with scenic art. It seems the work of one mind, in which all the parts are subordinate to the whole, and every private interest or convenience is subservient to a public result. Whereas in England or America you feel that the public has what is left after private interests and convenience have all been satisfied, you feel here that the public helps itself *first*, and flings the crumbs to the private citizen. Paris, therefore, imperial and spectacular as it is, is to a wonderful extent cosmopolitan and universal, and, therefore, spite of emperor and police, popular and democratic. For what can be so enriching and satisfying to the humble and poor as the feeling that while they have little or no private property, they are actual shareholders in immense public wealth and conveniences and splendour, to the common use of which they are freely invited! When I saw a poor woman sitting on the grass in the Tuilleries, within stone's throw of the palace, with her day's work of sewing lying round her, and her baby playing near, apparently in full enjoyment of the public protection and of the beauty of the noble garden, I understood how despotism might be rendered very tolerable by an enlightened policy, and how France and Paris, with their glory and strength and beauty, stand in the place of private possessions to millions of her people. They walk and stroll in her boulevards and parks, gratified and dazzled with the variety

and elegance and charm that everywhere greets them, without those feelings of discontent which we might expect from not being able to appropriate more to strictly private use."—pp. 21, 22.

Our author is equally fair and just in his impressions of the common schools of Paris, although he is undoubtedly mistaken in the opinion that it is by rote the children are taught. As he makes some good suggestions, however, we extract a passage:—

"Anxious to see the common schools of Paris, I obtained, not without difficulty, a special permit, and visited one boys' and one girls' school. The boys' school contained only about sixty children, from six to fourteen years of age. Two Catholic priests had it in charge. It was in two rooms—with a large open shed attached, where nearly half the boys were seated in the open air, learning their lessons from monitors—who repeated, out of a religious book, certain sentences wholly beyond any suggestion of meaning to children of such tender age, but which they learned by rote. In the older class-room, the walls were hung with admirable illustrations of all weights and measures, and with provisions for object-teaching. The excellent French method of *dictation* was here in full operation. The teacher dictates a sentence of some length to the whole class, who write it out in their copy-books. Here is a combined exercise in attention, memory, spelling, grammar, writing, composition, and style."—pp. 51, 52.

The Doctor always does quite well until the question of religion comes up; then he is slightly bigoted in spite of his "liberal Christianity." "Of religious education," he says, "there is a great show, and immense pains are taken by the priests to keep the paysans and common people in the love of the Church by *fêtes*, and by appeals to the senses through music, forms, and method" (p. 54). The Doctor forgot that there is a great show of religious education at home in New York also. In speaking of the music, he, doubtless, also forgot the opera singers employed in his own church, together with certain little habits and customs in regard to pews at the Church of All Souls. At all events, he treats Popery in Paris very gently; here he tells us nothing—at least, very little—of its demoralizing character. This part of the work he reserves until treating of poor communities—for nothing is easier than to find plausible reasons for the miseries of the oppressed and wretched; whereas, it would be self-contradictory to represent so enlightened and flourishing a capital as Paris as "crushed down under the iron heel of Popery." Our author is far too sagacious to commit such a blunder as this, and, accordingly, he pays the following tribute to the Sisters of Mercy:—

"A simple-hearted, sincere, and disinterested class they are; their faces marked by purity, self-control, and unworldliness. It was curious to see a party of six of these holy women, in their white, elephant-eared bonnets, examining the laces and jewelry of the Exposition, without cupidity or envy in their countenances, and as if satisfied with their own choice of an unworldly life, without being censorious to those who had chosen otherwise."—pp. 54, 55.

One would suppose that what produces such good results at Paris could not be very demoralizing in other parts of the world; but this, it seems, is a mistake. Thus, for example, Prague, the once flourishing

capital of Bohemia, is now proverbially poor, almost as much so as Warsaw, Dublin, or any other city that was once the seat of government, but is now under the dominion of a foreign power. Instead of having its own court, as it formerly had for many centuries, Prague is in the grasp of Austria; but this does not account for its present condition, according to Dr. Bellows. "A Catholicism," says our author, "more *intense*, more *universal*, more *superstitious*, and more *degrading* than is to be found in any part of Europe, holds the entire Christian population of Prague and Bohemia in its *smothering grasp*" (p. 411). Probably, the reason why the Parisians and the French in general are not also in a smothering condition is that they are too lively to submit to the process of Popish suffocation.

The Austrians, though not so far gone as the Bohemians, are in a melancholy plight, according to our author. "The next obstacle," he says, "to a true participation in the life of other great capitals, London, Paris, Berlin, New York, is the *shocking domination* of the Catholic hierarchy. Austria proper is almost a purely Catholic country" (p. 424). What wonder is it, then, that "it gropes in darkness and the shadow of death?" Yet Austria is not a whit more purely Catholic than France or Belgium. Under the head of "Popery rampant," we are told that "Roman Catholicism is not really alive (out of the Tyrol and a part of Bohemia), but its corpse *encumbers the whole ground*" (p. 425). "The priests hold the royal family in their grasp, and, through the emperor and the women of his house, largely control the policy of the government" (Ib.). Speaking of the archbishop, the Doctor says that he "is the only person who, day or night, has the privilege of entering unannounced the emperor's presence; and the people feel that this means only restraint and injustice for them" (p. 426).

Is it not a wonder they do not assassinate the archbishop, and cease to be such pure Catholics as they are? Why not try them with "liberal Christianity?" But we have not heard the worst yet. "They (that is, the people) dread, too, a back-stairs influence, exerted under ecclesiastical inspiration by the ladies of the court, even more than the influence on the emperor. They think measures often fail, after they have escaped all other opposition, from a final blow in the dark, dealt by a priest through a woman's sleeve" (Ib.).

We fear that some of this information reached the Doctor, if not through the imperial back-stairs, at least through some channel that was not very pure; otherwise he must have insinuated himself into the confidence of the people in a miraculous manner. He does not understand a word of their language; and it is to be presumed that they must be equally ignorant of his. Surely it would require more than two or three days, under such circumstances, to obtain accurate information of such vast importance, if some interpreting and far-seeing angel had not aided the Doctor in his researches.

The Jews fare little better than the Catholics at the hands of the representative of "liberal Christianity." He visited the synagogue at Berlin; there was a large congregation; a dozen officiating priests assisted in the service; the music was fine, &c. "But with a few exceptions, there was neither in the air of the priests, nor of the people, *any rapt attention or devout expression*. The whole thing seemed a pretty, heartless ceremonial; *the atmosphere was not worshipful*" (p. 349).

It is only in the churches dedicated to liberal Christianity—especially in All Souls' Church—that one can see this "rapt attention," and "devout expression," and breathe this "worshipful atmosphere." But, as already remarked, whenever the Doctor dismounts from his hobby he is communicative and interesting. "There are," he tells us, "twenty thousand Jews in Berlin, and they are far the richest portion of the community. They own the lots 'Unter den Linden,' and about the Thier-Garten. They are the millionaires, capitalists, bankers, and great merchants of the city" (p. 349). He might have told us that they are still more wealthy in Vienna and Paris;—also more highly respected, especially in the former city, where Rothschild has been ennobled and allowed to rank at the imperial court with the proudest of the Austrian nobility. But it was not necessary to leave the city of New York to find Jews who are "millionaires, capitalists, and great merchants." Would not B. L. Solomon & Sons, August Belmont, and several others we could mention, answer that description? and if our New York Jews have not lots "Unter den Linden," they have marble palaces shaded by as classic and beautiful a tree.

But there is one institution even in Vienna which has elicited the admiration of Dr. Bellows; we need hardly say we mean the theatre. "The Theatre," he says, "is an institution here of *incredible importance*. Many people seem to live in its heart" (p. 429). Nothing else makes so near an approach to "liberal churches." We are assured that the Court Theatre has "*a most refined and accomplished company, who act, on the whole, better than any company I have ever seen*" (Ib.). What a blessing it would be to have such a company in New York as an ally of liberal Christianity! There would be no need of building a new theatre for it; that parti-colored edifice at the corner of Fourth Avenue and Twentieth Street would fully answer the purpose.

The Doctor is very much disgusted at the lack of perception evinced by Europeans, especially by Parisians. "Improved as our reputation is," he says, "the ignorance about us is still gross and the *indifference still more so*" (p. 45). Is not this too bad! But let us hear a little more. "They know," quoth the Doctor, "we are growing rich and powerful; but they have no notion of our *civilization, our superiority in substantial respects, &c., &c.*" (Ib.). There are exceptions, however; the liberal Christians know better, for they have learned pretty nearly all they know from us. Thus, for instance, one of the shining lights of Europe

is the great Schenkel; now let us see how he came by his superior knowledge.

"He knew Channing's and Parker's writings well, and *theirs only*. Parker he had personally seen. He had never heard of James Martineau, although he knew of the English 'Essays and Reviews.' On the whole, English theology had not interested him. It was a derivation from the German, not an original shoot. He looked with much livelier sympathy upon the American Liberal Church. *It was so practical and so loving*. There is no manner of justice done to our American thinking or scholarship among the savans in Europe" (p. 314).

If this were a fair specimen of American thinking, certainly we could hardly blame the European savans for not thinking very highly of it. But they are to be duly prepared to do justice to our merits as follows: "I hope my colleague, Mr. Allen," says our author, "will see to it that the *Christian Examiner* reaches some of these men" (p. 315). If Mr. Allen only does his duty in this respect, there will be no difficulty in future as to our being respected as thinkers. True, we may fail to make them read the *Examiner*, although that is scarcely possible. At all events, let everybody read the book before us; much of the gravest part of it is as amusing as a comedy. We shall look with considerable curiosity for the second volume.

A Brief Sketch of the State of Europe during the Decade which terminated with the close of the late Prusso-Austrian War. 16mo., pp. 192. By HENRY D. ANSLEY, A. M., of the Middle Temple, London, 1868.

THIS is an interesting volume, but rather undecided in its views. It is valuable chiefly for its suggestions; rather than depend on its arguments, however, we will take a brief glance at the causes, and at some of the results of the war.

That the Germanic Bund was only a rope of sand, had long been apparent to statesmen of sagacity; and it was instantly demonstrated when, at a word from Bismarck, chaos reigned throughout the German principalities. A more sudden and complete dispersion never occurred since that of the builders of Babel. The "holy alliance" was a conspiracy against the natural and normal order of the States and nationalities of Europe. Its compacts and treaties had no stronger or more binding sanctions than the "honour" which is said to exist amongst thieves and robbers. Those compacts, the product of force, must be maintained by force, or they must cease. Against this force were arrayed two forces; the natural tendency of peoples to resume those normal conditions of nationality and relation which the alliance had disturbed, as well as the more complex resistance which France must ever offer, to that pressure which the alliance mainly directed against the integrity of the French empire, as it existed under the first Napoleon. These reactionary forces were constant. The affection which a people feel for

their own country, if its population are truly homogeneous, is the very soul and essence of patriotism. A people may behold their land parcelled out among foreign powers, and they may be told by their rulers, and even by the ministers of their religion, that patriotism among them is allegiance and fidelity to their new masters; but their hearts, bereaved of home and country, will maintain fealty only to the country they have loved and lost, and will join in sympathy, if not in voice, with the pathetic lament of the Israelites in their Babylonish captivity.

The repressive force to which these constant reactions were opposed, could not, in the nature of things, forever remain equally constant. With Poland absorbed, and, as far as possible, digested, Russia no longer found it to her interest to maintain a hostile attitude towards France; but, in the interest of her ambition to extend her frontiers to the Bosphorus, would prefer to conciliate that power. Italy, restored to the nationality so long forfeited, necessarily disturbed the equilibrium of Europe. Spain, once a potential member of the alliance, had become to it an element of weakness. Great Britain, the most powerful member of the alliance, withdrew herself from European complications. Austria, the original instigator of the alliance, was barely able to preserve her own equipoise, harassed as she was by the old kingdom of Hungary on the one side, and the new kingdom of Italy on the other.

Here was Prussia's opportunity. Prussia, as to her integral force altogether Germanic, somewhat embarrassed by a Scandinavian element on her eastern border, which might be paralyzed by an accession of the Teutonic element, and prevented only from absorbing that element by the participation of Austria in the domination of the Bund, and by the want of a pretext for disturbing the peace of Europe. That pretext was not afforded; the only pretext for hostilities was furnished by Prussia herself; yet, while Austria armed, she would not strike the blow. The sagacious mind of Bismarck discerned at once that the scrupulous fidelity of Austria was a capital circumstance in favour of Prussia, if, herself casting scruples to the winds, she, secretly as it were, armed with her redoubtable *zundnadelgewehr*, would, with the spring of the tiger attack her foe, and by rapid movements interpose between Austria and her allies of the Bund.

The execution of the plan was as complete as its conception was sagacious; the power of the confederation vanished like a morning exhalation; and Austria, the inventor of the holy alliance, lay bleeding and prostrate under the assassin arm of her most trusted ally; fallen, like Lucifer, "never to hope again." The "short, sharp, and decisive" campaign of the summer of 1866 annihilated all that remained of the famous, or infamous, holy alliance. It did not restore Europe to her normal nationalities, but it powerfully aided in opening the way for that restoration. It was one chapter in the partly written, and partly unwritten book of European destiny. Those who care more to discuss traits of

personal character than traits of political tendency, may well exclaim against what they will pronounce dishonourable conduct in the Prussian minister, and will lay on his soul the crime of all the bloodshed of the sanguinary struggle; but Bismarck was only working out the manifest destiny of Central Europe; and, while we may not justify his disregard of conscience and honour, we must confess that, if the situation of German affairs indicated a forcible solution, the one which he furnished was efficacious to the utmost of possibility, and attended with as few of the calamities of war as any similar conflict in history.

Prussia has only given impetus to a tendency in Europe towards republicanism, which tendency her state policy may retard, but cannot arrest, and which alone prevents Europe from succumbing to the semi-barbaric, yet colossal power that towers in her northeastern horizon. No circumstance could, in the existing state of European affairs, have had a more determinate tendency to hasten the restoration of the ascendancy of normal nationalities in Europe, than the pronounced rejection of the conservative monarchical policy of which the holy alliance was the main prop and stay; and to which rejection, the kingdom of Prussia, herself most deeply interested in the maintenance of that policy, gave the most significant emphasis. This is not the aspect in which Bismarck viewed the problem, on whose solution he so boldly ventured, but it is the aspect it will assume in history; and Prussia may yet come to understand the significance of the Scripture proverb—"All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"—of which Austria has furnished an illustration.

The solution of the European problem was susceptible of accomplishment by pacific methods, but for the unwise persistence of two opposite parties: one, those monarchists who determinedly oppose the tendency towards republicanism; and the other, those republican enthusiasts, who would hasten the consummation, which can only be happily assured by the slow but certain developments of time and opportunity. The policies of both these parties are futile. The healthy growth of liberal ideas and republican institutions will keep even pace with the increase and diffusion of knowledge and virtue among the industrial and rural populations of the Continent. Governments are maintained by arms, at least as the last resort; and whenever the individuals of which armies are composed are both virtuous and intelligent, there is developed in them an individuality of character which makes armies something more than the blind unreasoning masses, whom despots find so perfectly adapted to their purposes that they can calculate upon their political value, as players calculate the value of pawns upon a chess-board. The aggregate of these individuals constitute the State, whatever may be its form of government, and in them rests ultimately all the power of the State, wielded by them through the ballot it may be, or, if that is denied them, by the bullet, the last resort of peoples as well as of kings.

Progress towards a higher and better civilization is now the general law of European society. That this progress may be peaceful and beneficent in its every stage, it is needful that all the potentates of Europe should yield to it their cordial assent. Whatever government in Europe shall keep even pace with its invisible army of progress, marching in its van rather than straggling in its rear, will draw to itself allies in every part of the Continent, for the brotherhood of progress transcends the boundaries of States, and these allies will augment its power far beyond its necessities for self-defence, even though all the other powers of Europe were combined for its overthrow.

It would be happy for Europe, if all its sovereigns would with one consent concede every legitimate demand of the advancing spirit of liberalism; not every demand of closeted or rampant visionaries, of demagogues during the brief hour of their popularity, or of red-capped patriots affecting sansculottism; but the demands made by the common sense of the great masses, not usually made known through popular clamour or insurrectionary violence, but by signs quite as evident to the observant few whose especial duty it is to care for the public welfare.

A great people emerging from the imbecility concomitant with ignorance and servility, into a vigorous development and a liberal civilization, are like patients convalescing from illness; who are to be strengthened by tonics and nourished with wholesome aliment and exercise, not stimulated unduly and indulged in excesses, nor rendered innane by confinement and restraint. In every school there are classes, graduated according to the capacities and proficiency of the pupils; and this rule, whose wisdom, reason and experience have approved in the education of the young in years, reason and experience likewise attest as equally wise in application to the education of peoples in the great schools of national civilization.

Violent repressions and violent advances are equally fatal and futile in their results. The reactionary policy on which Prussia seems to be intent, can just now be maintained by the prestige of her late military triumphs, and may for a considerable time be carried forward by further demonstrations of martial force; but the sword of Mars is two-edged, and is often found to cut both ways, as Prussia will find in the sequel, if she presses her advantages too far. It were far better for all Europe if its government and people would have patience to deliberately untie the knot of their future destiny, and would not in their over eager haste attempt to sever it with the sword. It is not every trifling ailment that demands the surgeon's knife or the physician's bolus. A nation may be trusted to outgrow its petty grievances which are mostly transient, and are less to be deplored than the violent measures of those who would make haste to redress them.

The wise physician will often trust the recovery of his patient to the *vis medicatrix natura*, rather than deplete him with the lancet and de-

puratory potions; and the minor disorders of a State are often best rectified by the remedial agencies that wait on time and opportunity. Actual canterbury and cannon are remedies that should be reserved for those desperate emergencies where fatal issues are imminent. The rash facility with which resort is had to wars and insurrections, for comparatively trivial causes, finds its only parallel in the frivolous pretexts of the duellist, scarcely exaggerated by the fantastic imagination of Shakespeare's Touchstone.

Russia, though less advanced in civilization than most of the other countries of Europe, nevertheless affords an example worthy of their emulation. The Czar, actuated by an enlightened affection for his subjects, which is the true inspiration of wise statesmanship, is steadily carrying forward a graduated system of efficient measures for the enfranchisement and civilization of the whole body of the people throughout his vast empire, and is thus earning a better title to be styled "*Alexander the Great*," than the Macedonian who spread devastation and havoc from the sands of Libya to the banks of the Indus.

The institutions that are taking shape will be far more permanent if time is allowed for their cement to indurate. The forces that govern the world in this age are moral forces, and not the *brutum fulmen* of war. The true policy of the States of Europe is no longer one of aggression, but of self-augmentation. They must grow great, not by accretion but by incretion; not by what they acquire from without, but by what they develop from within. Among States and peoples that are equals, whatever one acquires from without, except by mutual exchanges, is robbery, and violates that great law of perfect reciprocity, on the obedience of which the tranquillity of international relations is dependent.

The victories of peace—not of war—are now the chief glory of States and empires. Formerly, palaces were for kings and conquerors, but now palaces are built in honour of *labour*, and to them crowned monarchs and their illustrious retainers resort to pay their homage. Our expositions of the arts and industries of the world, are so many acknowledgments that the truest virtue is that which achieves somewhat for the good of mankind. The practical solution of those grand problems in physics and in natural science, on which man's most perfect development depends, is to be found in the atelier of the artisan and in the fields of the agriculturist. Man, in his highest condition of civilization, mingles the philosophy of natural agencies with the actual demonstrations of muscular force; his spiritual and physical powers consentaneously unite their forces for the accomplishment of common purposes, and conformably to the normal laws of his physical and moral health; and thus each individual becomes, in all essential particulars, a perfect type of manhood, and labour, thus defined, is the noblest and most ennobling occupation of a human being. In our present stage of civilization, we are generally, as individuals, developed only partially, one man exereis-

ing his brain, another his muscles, few labouring with both, uniformly and harmoniously.

The labouring intellect despises the labouring hands, and the man who performs no labour, often despises both, and yet this idler is sometimes called a nobleman. Even this ignoble nobility, of indolence as it would seem, is yet a creature of labour. The idle noble of to-day, is the child of an ancestor who ennobled himself by somewhat that he achieved with much labour and puissant valour; and so supererogatory was the merit of his grand labours, that they, monumentally, ennoble even his unworthy offspring.

Among the people of a nation who are all of one race, a despotic government may be maintained for an almost indefinite length of time, secure from internal convulsions, and under such a government there may exist a large degree of personal liberty; for, amidst the quietude which pervades such a nation, customs become indurated into laws, of such binding efficacy, that the ruler is almost as much constrained by them as are his subjects; and in such a nation a civilization *sui generis* will become developed in considerable beauty and harmony. The Chinese empire is an example of the truth of this proposition. It is far otherwise with a State whose population, made up of different nationalities, wants the important element of homogeneity. The government of such a State must be either military or republican. The holy alliance is largely responsible for that condition of affairs in Europe which makes one of these forms of government a necessity in nearly every portion of the Continent.

No readjustment of the map of Europe will be permanent that is not subordinated to the interests and wishes of the peoples. The day is past when the interests of individual rulers and dynasties can long maintain an ascendant over those of the governed masses. The tendency of the nationalities to resolve themselves into homogeneous masses is constantly gaining momentum. The restoration of the unity of Italy demonstrates that in one instance this tendency has produced a positive result. Shall Germany be the next example of national regeneration? And if so, shall not Hungary and Poland reassert their nationality?

Austria, an empire made up of four principal elements, the German, Croatian, Slavie, and Magyar, whenever it loses its martial power, loses its ability to retain these incongruous elements in combination. Is not even the restoration of Grecian nationality among the future possibilities of Europe? When we have seen the small kingdom of Sardinia extend its dominion over the entire Italian peninsula, we have no good reason for denying the possibility that Greece and Spain may re-enact the parts they formerly played in the grand drama of European history.

One of the strongest tendencies of the present era in Europe, is to the advancement of her civilization, by the cultivation of those arts and

sciences which flourish only amidst general peace and tranquillity. The only cloud that threatens to disturb the peace of Europe is the Eastern question. Great Britain, whose present policy is pacific, and as to Continental questions, is as insular as is her geographical position, has impressed the policy of Europe with a principle which lies at the foundation of this momentous question; and that is the principle of maritime repression. Both her interest and her duty demand that she should lend the full weight of her influence to eliminate this disturbing element from the code of national law. The development of the immense agricultural and industrial resources of the Russian empire is pretermitted by the want of convenient and ample access to the great oceanic highways of commerce. If this access is much longer denied to Russia, she will obtain it by force. While Great Britain was the dominant maritime power of the world, it was fitting to her general policy that she should hold in check the gigantic power of the autocrat by limiting his maritime strength; but "Britannia rules the waves" no longer; and not only has her career of conquest reached its limit, her immense Indian dependencies are threatened. The retention of her sway in India, Australia, the Pacific Islands, and America, may well tax even her enormous power to the utmost that she can exert it beyond the bounds of the British Islands, where domestic troubles disquiet her. It is true that Ireland is weak, yet so was the little fox which the Spartan boy held beneath his tunic.

Every circumstance at home and abroad admonishes Great Britain of the necessity she is under of adhering to the pacific policy by which she professes to be governed. Let the law of nations be amended in the manner urged by the United States, by exempting peaceful commerce from the contingencies of war; make the Bosphorus and the Baltic as free as the Atlantic to the commerce of all nations; and the Eastern question will no longer disturb and perplex the diplomats of Europe. Russia does not want territory; she only wants commercial facilities, and *she will have them*. The day is not distant when the naval powers that dominate the Pacific Ocean will command an equal moiety of the commerce of the world, and their naval strength will be equal to that of the maritime powers of the Atlantic. The distance from the Amoor river to Australia and India and New Zealand, is not so great as from the British channel; nor should the recent capture of Bokara be overlooked. British statesmen of sagacity, considering these facts, with others that might be enumerated, should not be long in deciding whether it were best to play the part of a friend or that of an enemy to Russia.

The peace of Europe, which its inhabitants so earnestly desire, may be preserved, and with it prosperity and tranquillity, and gradual, yet steady, advancement in those political ameliorations which will make its States and peoples prosperous and happy; but persistence in forcible repression of civil liberty, and in the reactionary policy of her absolutists,

will inevitably precipitate revolutions that will overturn, one after another, every monarchy in the whole Continent.

INSURANCE.

1. *New Charters of Insurance Companies and other Documents.*
2. *Ninth Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Insurance Department—Fire and Marine.*

WE shall not say much these warm days on so exciting a subject as insurance; we prefer to advise both the insurers and the insured to keep as cool as they can for the next six weeks or so. Especially would we urge this on the "Insurance Press," which ought to be pretty wearied of fighting by this time. Doubtless they find their account in calling each other thieves, pirates, black-mailers, fugitives from justice, ignoramuses, &c., &c. Certainly, it is more profitable for their employers to pay them for making sport for them in this manner, than for getting up puffs that turn the laugh on the other side.

It is rather a humiliating kind of business for honest people to fight for the amusement of others; but it has the advantage of being very ancient, if not time-honoured. Did not the Roman gladiators not only attack each other with the greatest ferocity for money, but also attack wild beasts in the arena? Do not the Spanish bull-fighters pursue the same *métier* at the present day? It is true that we may seem to have a selfish object in showing thus that the system is classical, since as long as the insurance journals are abusing each other so fiercely as they have been for the last two or three months, they can hardly find time to abuse us. Be this as it may, we prefer to see them at peace with each other; and with this philanthropic view we beg leave remind them that it is only the lower breeds even of the canine species that tear each other for a bone; in proof that the educated spaniel, setter, or pointer never does so, we refer to Buffon, who, it will be admitted, is a good authority on Assurance as well as on the habits and customs of ferocious animals.

We also beg leave to remind all concerned, that it is not those who fight most desperately for the bone, that always get it. It sometimes happens that another animal, who has exposed himself to no danger, sneaks up to the scene of conflict, and carries off the prize in triumph. Has nothing of this kind occurred lately? Let the quack champions please look around them and see whether they have any new allies. You know, gentlemen, how many handsome jobs we have put in your way during the last seven years; if you are honest you will admit that you have got more ten-dollar checks and larger plates of oysters for abusing the National Review and its editor, than for any other outside work whatever. This was all very well, perhaps; we do not grudge you all you have made by us; indeed, we prefer that you should have the money

rather than the quacks and sharpers who employ you. But you were unwise in boasting of it.

A certain journal that died once of inanition, but has been brought to life again in a somewhat miraculous manner, took the hint, and also tried its hand on the *National Review*, showing how impudent and stupid it is in meddling with subjects so far beyond its ken, as Insurance, Martin Luther, Impeachment, &c., but especially Insurance. This did very well for the time,—the hat was let round before and after the work was done, and a few greenbacks were thrown into it; but we fear not sufficient to make the thing pay as a whole. For our own part we wish to deal very gently with those who rise from the dead, for such are apt to be consumptive at best. We are willing to admit that what they say should be listened to with great attention, although it be as dull and pointless as what they said before their death. Who, for example, does not mark every sepulchral word uttered by the Ghost in Hamlet? The Royal Dane was a very common-place personage, before he descended to Hades; but once risen from the dead, he is a hero. All his faculties are improved; he has even learned several languages while in his grave!

When the hat alluded to was let round the second or third time, certain objections were made, even by the quacks, which may be condensed as follows:—"We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Sellula, for attacking the *National Review*; we are willing to pay you for that; but we cannot patronize you as a regular thing." Being pressed for the reason, the interlocutor proceeds to say:—"Well, to tell you the truth, we consider your Sellula too dull." Mr. Sellula gets offended, and gives the insurer a bit of his mind. "There's no use in mincing the matter," retorted the latter; "to pay a donkey for braying at a lion will never do."

Mr. Sellula hesitated a little, as if struck by a new thought. "Well, you say that none read the Sellula but overgrown boys learning composition and ambitious to become authors; and I must admit myself that we have to depend a good deal on that class." "Yes," interrupted another, "and you depend a good deal, also, on your wholesale puffery of the publishers. Now, these long-winded puffs are very good things, perhaps, for the owners of the books; but how many others ever read them?" "Then suppose," says Mr. Sellula, "that we *compile* a paper?" "What do you mean? I never thought yours any thing else but a compilation." "But supposing we get up a paper, consisting exclusively of articles taken from other papers, and duly acknowledged as such?" "Certainly, if you collect the brilliant, pointed, sensible articles of our principal daily and weekly papers, and insert them without a word of your own, you will have twenty times as many readers as you have for the Sellula; but rather few, after all, for not many like to buy second-hand goods, of that kind, especially when the new article is so cheap." The manuscript of our correspondent becomes illegible here, and so we cannot say what was the final agreement between the quacks and their new champion. We trust, at

all events, that an arrangement was made which will prevent a second death, at least for some time.

Now, far be it from us to advise the insurance journals to be so hard-hearted as not to be concerned for the untimely demise of a fellow-creature. All we ask them to do is to cease fighting among themselves; then they will lose fewer bones, and have time to treat outsiders, like ourselves, as they deserve. It might be the wisest way, for the *Sellula* also, to mind its own Insurance or *Assurance* business, and allow other journals to mind theirs; still if it has a taste for that sort of work, we are satisfied. We are even willing to put it on the way of making quite a handsome affair by its lucubrations against us. We presume that Morgan, of the North American Life, has already contributed towards the good cause. But has Eadie, of the United States Life, put any thing into the hat? Has Batterson been applied to? or Guy Phelps? What of the Sun Mutual and its "scrip" dividends? Since the Metropolitan reduced its capital, refusing to enter the grave yet a while, it has learned to appreciate even an awkward, pointless onslaught on those who are inconveniently curious about its "assets."

We might add quite a number of similar insurers; indeed, there is scarcely an insurer in the United States whose policy is of questionable value, who would not give at least ten dollars for more or less abuse of the National Review.

Then, again, there are insurers of a different class who, we are sure, would contribute ten, or even twenty dollars a piece, rather than allow any journal that has ever published three articles of any kind on Life Insurance to die of inanition. As a proof that, instead of being vindictive, or wishing to return evil for evil, we are disposed to do even our enemies a good turn, we will mention some of this class also, and at the same time take occasion to show, as far as the facts are within our reach, how well they can afford to be philanthropic and charitable.

Take the Knickerbocker Life, for example, to begin with. There is no journal published in New York which may be called "literary," even by the greatest stretch of courtesy, which Mr. Lyman would see give up the ghost for \$50. And what are his means? The best answer to this is to be found in the fact that during the year which closed June 1, 1868, his company issued twelve thousand (12,000) policies, insuring \$42,000,000, and that it issued more policies during the last month of the year than any other month, namely, fourteen hundred (1,400), insuring nearly \$5,000,000.

We do not know how many the Equitable, the Manhattan, or the National, has issued since our last report, but we are sure that each has done good work, and equally sure that the officers of each are sufficiently imbued with the benevolent spirit of their profession to contribute more or less to keep away death, without examining too curiously into the quality of the article which they are called upon to save.

Nor would we have journalists struggling for existence, fail to state their case to the officers of the Continental Life, and the Security Life. The former is only two years in existence; but it has issued seven thousand eight hundred (7,800) policies, insuring \$22,000,000. One of the reasons of this remarkable success is, that the company pays its losses promptly, generally before the time allowed by law, or by the conditions of the policy; another is that its agents are "picked men" in their calling.

But we have no Life company that can better afford to give a contribution for a charitable object than the Security, for like its Fire namesake to which we shall have occasion to refer before we close, it is worthy of its name. It has now an income of nearly a million a year (\$900,000), and its assets amount to a million and a half (\$1,500,000).

If the *Sellula* cannot secure its life among all these companies, then it might try Boston and Hartford. The New England Mutual, the *Ætna*,* the Phoenix, and the Charter Oak, are each staunch friends of literature, and each can well afford to contribute. The journal that any of the four would insure need have no fear of death, at least for some years, let it be ever so bombastic—no matter how stale may be its platitudes.

It is true they do not insure consumptives—only those who are sound, at least to all appearance. But none are more charitable, however; none would give a donation more readily; and will not this do? Medicine can be got for money any day; and we have no doubt that Dr. Phelps would give a whole basket of his famous "tomato pills" for a puff of about a column. Then, if all fails, Batterson has the tombstones ready-made; all that need be added is the epitaph.

We are quite aware it may be said that we, probably, know all this from our own experience; but be it remembered that we have never died, and, consequently, never risen from the dead. When we give up the ghost once, we do not intend to haunt our friends; we mean that it shall not be necessary to write our epitaph a second time.

Speaking of epitaphs, reminds us of the somewhat remarkable fact that the Provident Life and Investment Company, of Chicago, "still lives;" nay, the more epitaphs written upon it the better it seems to thrive! According to Batterson & Co., it was dead nearly a year ago; but we have good reason to believe that it has more vitality at this moment than either the Travellers or the Railway Passengers; nay, than both together. Four Chicago papers now before us, namely, the Tribune, the Republican, the Times, and the Insurance Chronicle, bear emphatic testimony to its honesty and reliability, and show that "it has fully vindicated itself from the charges made against it by interested and somewhat unprincipled parties."

* The *Ætna* Live Stock Insurance Company is destined to prove another great institution. The fact that the officers of the *Ætna* Life have identified themselves with it, has given it a prestige at once; and caused thousands to have their favourite horses insured in it. Nothing but want of time has prevented ourselves from securing its policy for our trusty Kentuckian. "Boppo."

We have been at the pains of examining the facts of the case, from time to time, with the view of showing that those who are tricky in their dealings themselves, are very apt to charge their rivals in business with being tricky also. Our readers will remember that if the representations of Batterson & Co. had been accepted, nobody would have taken a policy from the Provident Life.

Now, is this honest or respectable? In our opinion it is the reverse. And, if we practise differently from what we preach, when have we attacked any Quarterly Review? Have we ever abused the North American Review, or said a disrespectful word of it? Nay, when have we attacked any journal or journalist whatever, except in self-defence? There is room enough for us all; and we hold that no one profits in the long run by vilifying his rivals.

Although we have the valuable and interesting Fire and Marine Report of Superintendent Barnes before us, we can do little more than allude to it in our present number; we shall have to be still briefer, and more desultory, than we have been in our observations on Life Insurance; but we promise our readers that we shall examine both departments searchingly in our September number. By that time all the Life Annual Reports of State Superintendents and Commissioners will have been issued; and with the large increase of Insurance Companies—new corporations starting into existence almost weekly—they can hardly fail to contain facts and statistics interesting to all; and it is not unlikely that they will make disclosures which ought to put the public on its guard against the new insurers—especially the new Life insurers, who make such extraordinary promises.

We might easily fill many pages now with facts which might well be regarded as startling; but we wish to obtain all the information we can, and finally subject that information to a careful test, lest we might make statements calculated to injure honest men. Had we not been thus careful for the last seven years, we could not have criticised so freely as we have, and yet defied those most anxious to silence us, from pointing out a single misrepresentation in our pages.

Mr. Barnes not only gives us a large amount of valuable statistics in the Report before us; he also makes some suggestions which both insurers and insured would do well to remember. This is true for example of the following remarks:—

"The actuarial work of collecting and arranging the statistics of fires in all sections of this country, and adjusting a net rate of premium adequate to provide a fund to meet the losses, is not the only object of these investigations; an analytic and scientific inquiry should be made, not only as to the actual historic facts, but as to their physical and moral causes. Take the single case of spontaneous combustion—how many agents and policy-holders have the requisite knowledge to prevent and avoid fires of this nature? The inventive genius and multiplied resources of modern times are vastly increasing also, the number of incendiary articles; coal oils in all their varied forms, nitro-glycerine and other new articles of commerce demand constant study, care and watchfulness. Many

fires are doubtless caused by a violation of the plainest principles governing the storage and use of these articles, and it may be questioned whether it is not much cheaper for the companies to collect and disseminate information on these subjects than simply to charge excessive premiums in order to pay excessive losses."

No intelligent person will deny this. Our fire-companies are entirely too careless — not to say thoughtless. The truth is, that the majority have not much information themselves; and what people do not possess they cannot disseminate. Underwriters who are intelligent and thoughtful are sure to succeed in time even when it happens that they have sustained more losses than their neighbours. We may give an illustration or two of this before we close; but we will first give our readers some of the results of the State Superintendent's researches: —

"The fearful crime of arson seems to be increasing, and the practical underwriter should scan the moral hazards in this direction with an omniscient ken. Many difficulties ordinarily obstruct the complete discovery and proof of incendiary fires, whether originating with the owner or other persons, and it may become necessary to allow a Fire Marshal or other officer, as in San Francisco, *to take entire possession of any building discovered to be on fire, and thus preserve any evidences of guilt which might otherwise be destroyed.* If our losses continue to increase so alarmingly, a joint commission of inquiry on the part of the State, and of the State Board of Underwriters might subserve the public interests in the premises.

"It is said that the ancient punishment of incendiaries was death by fire, thus visiting on them a fate which their crime might inflict upon others."

The suggestion we have marked in italics is worthy of attention. San Francisco is by no means the only city in which this precaution is adopted; exactly the same course is pursued in several of the German states. But nowhere is some such protection more necessary than in New York. It is notorious, also, that in no other great city are incendiaries treated more leniently; even when convicted they are generally let loose on society again before they have served half the time for which they have been sentenced. But others are sometimes to blame as well as incendiaries, judges, and governors.

"Complaint has been made to the Superintendent that some companies *unfairly reduce their liabilities* under the item of re-insurance, *by stating the net instead of the actual gross amount of premiums received on outstanding risks.* The re-insurance fund for unexpired fire risks being fixed at one-half the premiums received thereon, a diminution of such premiums of course reduces liabilities, and may result in showing a fictitious surplus; it seems to be a work of supererogation to state that any reduction from the gross amount of premiums for brokerage, commissions or any other expense, is not allowed under the blank form for Annual Statements, and is *a plain and palpable misrepresentation of the actual facts.* Such an *evasion* also creates a necessity for another misrepresentation; the actual expenditures are misreported by excluding the amount paid for commissions and other expenses; thus culpably diminishing the ratio of expenses to income. All such *subterfuges* are unworthy of the business, and if heretofore practised, should be discontinued voluntarily in advance of any compulsory measures for their suppression."

If our readers will only exercise their memory a little, they will be

able to divine some of the parties here alluded to. No wonder that capitals have to be reduced sometimes, and that "scrip" has to be declared worthless in order to avoid the grave, although it would be much more honourable to die in such cases than to continue to drag out a sickly existence.

In the present Report we have an unusual variety of valuable tables. Evidently prepared with great care, they are interesting to all who take an interest in the progress of society, its fluctuations, and its tendencies. The Superintendent refers to them with just pride, and adds some suggestions which honest underwriters will do well to reflect upon.

"The preceding pages contain the most extensive and reliable statistics of the business of Fire Insurance Underwriting ever published in this country. The grand aggregate of \$244,351,820.00 in Premiums and \$148,639,831.11 in Losses, shows a percentage of Loss to Premium of 60.83 per cent. This ratio, however, is not so large as the facts require; inasmuch as in cases of failures and receiverships, the Premium income ceases and outstanding Losses are often liquidated from Capital; and no statements of such companies have ever been required to be filed in this Department by Receivers, prior to the Act of 1867. (Chap. 709.) With Premiums adjusted as in the past, the law of average Loss demonstrated by experience, is evidently about *sixty-one* per cent. of Premium received.

"In Great Britain, thirty per cent. is not considered as an excessive ratio for the total management expenses of a Fire Insurance Office. This assumption would leave our American Companies only *nine per cent. of Premium for profits, and reserve funds*, which margin is subject to reduction also by enhanced expenses and increased taxation during and since the war. The stubborn facts which these figures record, clearly demonstrate that the present rates of Fire Premium may be adjusted, but not reduced, and that then by a rigid economy of management only, and the adoption of such a system of legislation and Fire Insurance practice, as will check the occurrence of so many fires, can a large profit be hereafter realized by the underwriter. The social economist and patriot must deeply mourn the fearful destruction of national wealth and resources which our Fire losses now entail upon the country. The realized profits of the underwriter are not lost to the nation; and this profit can be obtained the most readily by the efficient performance of the patriotic duty of preventing as well as extinguishing fires."

It will be borne in mind that more than once we took the liberty of making some comments on the management, or rather mismanagement, of the Pacific Mutual, by its late President. The gentleman was finally allowed to retire, and it seems the company has been doing tolerably well since. What we intimated two or three years ago is thus confirmed in the report of the Superintendent:—

"The Pacific Mutual has a surplus of \$119,352.66 above its Scrip Capital of \$706,635. This surplus would have been increased considerably but for serious losses, during the year, on investments, resulting from loans to its former President on *insufficient or speculative collaterals*. If loans are ever allowed to be made to the officers or directors of a company, such loans should be scrutinized by the finance committee or auditor with extraordinary care and vigilance. Easy facilities for borrowing corporate money may tempt the custodians of trust funds to make loans to themselves for the purposes of stock speculation, the fruits of which, if successful, will be grasped by the individual, and any heavy losses may be turned over to the corporation, through the medium of a *badly-secured stock loan*" (p. 45).

It is but fair to say, however, that the ex-president of the Pacific was by no means alone in this sort of business; there are many other presidents and vice-presidents who set much more value on what they make in this way than on their salaries. But we have remarked that intelligent, honest, and energetic underwriters, generally triumph over the most serious difficulties, whilst those of a different character either fail altogether, or damage their reputations so much that failure ought to be a relief to them. We have often spoken in these pages of the substantial good done by the Mercantile Mutual (Marine), while some of its Wall Street neighbours occupied themselves in boasting of their immense "scrip," or delivering foolish speeches at political meetings. Last year the Mercantile Mutual met with unusual losses; but that it met those losses characteristically, will sufficiently appear from the following extract from Mr. Barnes' Report:

"The Losses of the Company paid in 1867, were \$903,783.83, against cash premiums of only \$981,179.71. In order to *strengthen the position of the Company* and to put its affairs in a *safe and responsible condition for prosperous business*, the Directors on the 7th day of February last, obtained a subscription of \$300,000 in security notes, (not negotiable for Premiums on other debts due to the Company,) for which seven per cent. per annum commission is payable to the makers, and the dividends on Capital stock are limited to seven per cent. per annum, so long as these notes remain with the Company and until the accumulated profits and earnings shall be sufficient to replace the said security notes. The subscribers to the security notes, are to be properly represented in the Board of Directors and on the Finance Committee" (p. 44).

In this record we have another agreeable proof that honesty is the best policy. We hope others will profit by it. The Sun Mutual, it seems, is on the stool of repentance; it will not swagger any longer, nor issue spurious scrip, but be a "conservative," respectable corporation. Mr. Barnes inform us how it is to mend its reputation:—

"Instead of marking-off *pro rata* up to the time when a vessel has been last spoken or reported in safety, the conservative principle has been adopted of reserving the whole premium until the risk has been actually terminated by the expiration of the period for which the same was written."

It is nearly time that it should not begin to count its chickens until they are hatched. But let us turn to those who have a brighter record, and are neither boasters nor brawlers—much less, insolent or overbearing.

The Security Insurance Company shows by its statement (June 1st) the goodly aggregate of \$1,565,927.14, assets; proving that, so far this year, prosperity has waited upon the untiring efforts of the company's officers. We happen to know, moreover, that it has made nearly \$350,000, during the past twelve months, which circumstance, added to the immense improvements made by the new administration, certainly will render unnecessary any further endorsement from us as to the solvency and prudent management of this company under its new régime. We

have compared the Security Life to the Security Fire; now we compare the latter to the former, feeling that one is as solid and benevolent an institution as the other.

It seems that neither Mr. Barnes nor any other commentator deems it necessary to make any explanatory remark when speaking of the "unsatisfactory condition" of the Washington Insurance Company. Everybody appears to understand perfectly, that when any equivocal epithets are used, the flourishing institution at the corner of Broadway and Maiden Lane is not alluded to; and so secure does the company itself feel in its reputation, that it takes no notice of what may be said of those who have done violence to the good name which it so worthily bears.

We are glad to see that the Superintendent bears testimony to the soundness and integrity of the Hope Fire. Last year it sustained heavy losses, but it met them manfully; and we predicted at the time that the public would appreciate it accordingly. But we will allow Mr. Barnes to speak of one other Fire company:—

"The premiums of the *Ætna*, of Hartford, nearly equal those of the great consolidated English company, the Liverpool, London, and Globe, and exceed the premiums of the *Royal Insurance Company* by more than \$1,000,000."

Well may that little Yankee city be proud; for it is not one great *Ætna* it can boast. It has two Phoenixes, and two Charter Oaks. But although comparisons are not always agreeable, we, whose business it is to review and state facts, may say that there is but one genuine *Phœnix* and one genuine *Charter Oak* at Hartford; and that neither has any thing to do with any other *fire* than that which good old Prometheus brought down from Heaven.

NEW ENGLAND
Mutual Life Insurance Co.
 OF
 BOSTON.

BRANCH OFFICE, 110 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Directors in Boston.

SEWELL TAPPAN,
 MARSHALL P. WILDER,
 JAMES S. AMORY,
 CHARLES HUBBARD,
 GEORGE H. FOLGER,

HOMER BARTLETT,
 FRANCIS C. LOWELL,
 DWIGHT FOSTER,
 JAMES STURGIS,
 BENJ. F. STEVENS.

BENJAMIN F. STEVENS,
President.

JOSEPH M. GIBBENS,
Secretary.

Accumulation.....\$5,500,000

Distribution of Surplus in 23 yrs \$3,000,000

Losses Paid in 23 Years, \$2,800,000.

Policies of all descriptions are issued by this Company.

Distributions of Surplus are to be made annually, beginning November, 1867.

Printed documents pertaining to the subject, together with the report of the Company for the past year, and tables of premiums, supplied gratis, or forwarded free of expense, by addressing

SAMUEL S. STEVENS,

Agent and Attorney for the Company,

No. 110 BROADWAY,

Cor. of Pine Street,

NEW YORK CITY.

Continental Life Insurance Co.

OF
NEW YORK.

Office, No. 26 Nassau Street, corner of Cedar.

DIRECTORS.

JAMES B. COLGATE,
of Trevor & Colgate, Bankers.

C. M. DEFEW,
late Secretary of State.

JUSTUS LAWRENCE,
President.

G. H. SCRIBNER,
Vice-President.

JOSEPH T. SANGER,
Merchant, No. 45 Liberty Street.

M. B. WYNKOOP,
of Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, 113 Fulton Street.

Rev. H. C. FISH, D.D.,
Newark, N. J.

RICHD. W. BOGART,
of O. M. Bogart & Co., Bankers.

LUTHER W. FROST,
New York.



OFFICERS.

President,
JUSTUS LAWRENCE.

Vice-President,
G. H. SCRIBNER.

Secretary,
J. P. ROGERS.

Actuary,
R. C. FROST.

Medical Examiner,
E. D. WHEELER,
M. D.

PROFITS OF THE COMPANY ANNUALLY DIVIDED.

ONE-THIRD OF THE PREMIUM MAY REMAIN UNPAID AS A LOAN.

NO NOTES REQUIRED.

POLICIES NON-FORFEITABLE.

THIRTY DAYS' GRACE ALLOWED IN PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.

INSURED HAVE THE WIDEST LIBERTY TO TRAVEL WITHOUT
EXTRA CHARGE.

Policies issued to January 1, 1868,	5,593
Amount Insured,	\$15,873,300.00
Income,	1,138,302.70
Dividend declared, January 27, 1868,	40 per cent.

COLLEGE

OF THE

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

This Literary Institution possesses all the advantages of an agreeable and healthy location, easy of access, being situated on a rising ground, a little southwest of the Pacific Railroad terminus, in the city of St. Louis, Missouri. It was founded in 1851 by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, incorporated in 1855 by the State Legislature, and empowered to confer degrees and academical honors. However favorable the auspices under which it commenced its literary career, its progress since has surpassed all anticipation. Growing equally in public confidence and in the number of students, it has gone on extending its reputation. Repeated additions have been made to the original buildings. The number of students received within the last year amounted to more than 600, and many applicants were refused admission for want of room.

Every possible attention is paid to whatever can contribute to the health and happiness of its inmates—ventilation, cleanliness, spacious halls, dormitories, refectory, recreation halls for cold or damp weather, &c., &c.

The various arts and sciences usually taught in colleges find here an appropriate place in a system of education established by experience, conducted on the most approved plan, and with a devotedness commensurate with the greatness of the work engaged in. By reason of the great number of classes, a thorough graduation for all capacities and acquirements has been attained, and the frequent examinations and promotions begot emulation, the soul of advancement, making labor a pleasure, and success certainty.

The course of instruction pursued in the Academy is divided into three departments: the primary, the intermediate, and the collegiate. There is, besides, an exclusively commercial course, offering rare advantages to young gentlemen who intend to make business their profession. It is divided into three classes, in which the chief place is given to instruction in Book-keeping, Arithmetic, Geography, and History, Business Forms, and Correspondence, Epistolary Composition, Penmanship, &c., with Lectures on Commercial Law, Political Economy, &c., Diplomas can be obtained in the commercial department by such as merit that distinction.

The session commences on the last Monday in August, and ends about the 3d of July, with an annual public examination, a distribution of premiums, and the conferring of degrees and academical honors.

On the completion of the course the degree of A. B. is conferred upon such students as, on examination, are found worthy of that distinction. The degree of A. M. can be obtained by graduates in the first degree after two years devoted to some scientific or literary pursuit, their moral character remaining unexceptionable.

The government is a union of mildness and firmness, energy and kindness, a blending of paternal solicitude with fraternal sympathy; the results of which are contentment, good order, and happiness. The morals and general department of the students are constantly watched over: the Brothers preside at their recreations, and their comfort and personal habits receive every attention.

T E R M S :

Entrance Fee.....	\$8 00
Board and Tuition, per session.....	250 00
Washing.....	20 00
Physician's Fee.....	8 00
For Half Boarders.....	100 00
For Day Scholars.....	60 00
In the Senior Classes.....	40 00
Vacation at the Institution.....	40 00

Music, Drawing, and the use of apparatus in the study of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy form extra charges.

N. B.—Payments semi-annually, and invariably in advance.

No deductions for absence, except in case of protracted illness or dismissal.

✓ No extra charges for the study of the German, French, and Spanish Languages.

MERCANTILE MUTUAL

(MARINE)

INSURANCE COMPANY,

No. 35 Wall Street, New York.

ASSETS, - - - - \$1,464,419

This Company takes Marine and Inland Navigation Risks on Merchandise, Freight, and Hulls of Vessels. On the payment of Premiums, a Rebate or Discount on the current rates is made *in cash* as an equivalent for the Scrip Dividends of a Mutual Company. The amount of such Rebate, being fixed according to the character of the business, gives to Dealers a more just apportionment of profits than by the mutual system; and, being made *in cash*, on payment of the premium is more than equivalent to the *cash value* of the average Scrip Dividends of Mutual Companies.

Policies issued making loss payable in Gold in this city, or in Sterling at the Office of the Company's Bankers in Liverpool, if desired.

TRUSTEES.

JAMES FREELAND,
SAMUEL WILLETTS,
ROBERT L. TAYLOR,
WILLIAM T. FROST,
WILLIAM WATT,
HENRY EYRE,
CORNELIUS GRINNELL,
JOSEPH SLAGG,
JAS. D. FISH,
GEO. W. HENNINGS,
A. FOSTER HIGGINGS,
FRANCIS HATHAWAY,
A. WILLIAM HEYE,

AARON L. REID,
ELLWOOD WALTER,
D. COLDEN MURRAY,
E. HAYDOCK WHITE,
N. L. MCCREADY,
DANIEL T. WILLETTS,
L. EDGARTON,
HENRY R. KUNHARDT,
JOHN S. WILLIAMS,
WILLIAM NELSON, JR.,
CHARLES DIMON,
HAROLD DOLLNER,
PAUL N. SPOFFORD.

ELLWOOD WALTER,

President.

CHAS. NEWCOMB,

Vice-President.

C. J. DESPARD, Secretary.

THIRTY-THIRD DIVIDEND.

SAFEST AND CHEAPEST SYSTEM OF INSURANCE.

STATEMENT OF THE

Washington Insurance Co.,

172 BROADWAY, cor. of Maiden Lane,

New York, February 7, 1868.

CASH CAPITAL - - - - - \$400,000

ASSETS, February 1, 1868.

United States, State, and City Bonds (market value).....	\$411,868 00
Bonds and Mortgages.....	86,945 50
Demand Loans.....	158,450 00
Cash.....	56,077 99
Unpaid Premiums.....	12,798 79
Miscellaneous.....	45,238 20

LIABILITIES.....

\$766,171 48
29,971 48

Capital and Net surplus - - - - - \$736,200 00

A DIVIDEND OF (6) SIX PER CENT. is this day declared, payable on demand, in CASH, to Stockholders.

Also, AN INTEREST DIVIDEND OF (6) SIX PER CENT. on outstanding Scrip, payable first of April in CASH.

Also, A SCRIP DIVIDEND OF (33 $\frac{1}{3}$) THIRTY-THREE AND ONE-THIRD PER CENT. on the earned premiums of Policies entitled to participate in the profits for the year ending 31st January, 1868.

The Scrip will be ready for delivery on and after the first of April next.

The Scrip of 1862 will be redeemed on the First of April next, with interest, after which date the interest thereon will cease.

GEO. C. SATTERLEE, President.
HENRY WESTON, Vice-President.

WM. K. LOTHROP, Secretary.
WM. A. SCOTT, Assistant Secretary.

LAW SCHOOL

OF THE

University of Albany.

This School has now THREE TERMS A YEAR. The FIRST commences on the FIRST TUESDAY of September, the SECOND on the LAST TUESDAY of November, and the THIRD on the FIRST TUESDAY of March, each term continuing twelve weeks.

Three successive terms constitute the entire course, and entitle the student to become a candidate for the degree of Bachelor of Laws. Each term is independent and complete as to the instruction embraced in it. The method of teaching is by lecture, examination, and practice in the Moot-Courts. Two lectures are given each day, except Saturdays, and two Moot-Courts held each week, at which causes are first argued by the previously appointed disputants, then discussed and decided by the class, followed by the views of the presiding Professor. The law is taught both as a Science and an Art.

The immense *Law Library of the State* is open to the students, under proper regulations, and all the Terms of the *Supreme Court* and the *Court of Appeals*, the highest Courts of this State, are held in the City of Albany.

The Fee for a single term is \$40, for two terms, \$70, and for three, \$100, each payable in advance. The Professors, and leading topics upon which they lecture, are the following:

HON. IRA HARRIS, LL D., Practice, Pleadings, Evidence.

HON. AMASA J. PARKER, LL D., Real Estate, Criminal Law, Personal Rights.

AMOS DEAN, LL D., Personal Property, Contract, Commercial Law.

Circulars obtained by addressing AMOS DEAN, Albany, N. Y.

HON. REUBEN H. WALWORTH, LL D., *President*.

ORLANDO MEADS, LL D., *Secretary*.

MANHATTAN COLLEGE,

(CHRISTIAN BROTHERS.)

MANHATTANVILLE, NEW YORK.

This institution, incorporated and empowered to confer Degrees by the Regents of the University of the State of New York, offers many advantages to further the moral, intellectual, and physical developments of students. The situation of the College is not surpassed in landscape beauty, or salubrity, by that of any similar institution in the country. It occupies an elevated position on the east bank of the Hudson, beside the village of Manhattanville, about eight miles from New York city.

Its object is to afford the youth of our country the means of acquiring the highest grade of education attained in the best American universities or colleges. While its conductors mean that the classic languages shall be thoroughly studied, they have resolved to give a prominence to the higher mathematics and natural sciences not hitherto received in any similar institution in this country; thus combining the advantages of a first-class College and Polytechnic Institute.

Before receiving any degree, the classical student will be required not only to be able to translate with facility any classic author, whether Greek or Latin, whose style he has studied; he must also be able to express his ideas orally as well as in writing, with more or less fluency, at least in the latter language; whereas the mathematical student seeking similar distinction must extend his scientific knowledge so as to embrace the differential and integral calculus, together with astronomy, chemistry, &c.

The Faculty believe that neither the classics nor the mathematics claim more earnest attention, in order to constitute a sound and practical education, than the vernacular language and literature, and accordingly their study is never intermitted at this

institution, but is continued throughout the whole course in every form which has received the approval of the most experienced and successful educators.

Besides being carefully instructed in the analytical principles of the language, every student is required not only to take part in oral discussions on rhetoric, logic, moral philosophy, &c., but he must also write English essays on various subjects, which are, in turn, subjected to the criticisms of the whole class, as well as to those of the Professor having charge of that department.

Although the regular preparatory schools of the college are the De La Salle Institute, 46 Second Street, and Manhattan Academy, 127 West Thirty-second Street, New York, another has been established at the college for the benefit of those who wish to send their children to the institution at an early age.

TERMS:

Board, Washing, and Tuition, per Session of ten months.....	\$300
Entrance Fee	10
Graduation Fee	10
Vacation at College.....	40

German, Spanish, Drawing, Music, and use of apparatus in the study of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy, charged extra. School books at current prices.

No student received for a shorter period than one term of five months—no deductions made when withdrawn during the term. The pocket-money of the student is deposited with the treasurer.

Payment of half Session of five months in advance.

The sessions commence on the first Monday in September and end about the 3d of July.

A public examination of the students is held at the end of the session, and gentlemen are invited to examine them then, and also during the class hours of term time.

 For particulars see Catalogue.

MR. VAN NORMAN'S

ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Family & Day School

FOR YOUNG LADIES,

5 West Thirty-eighth Street, New York,

TWO DOORS FROM FIFTH AVENUE.

The School Year extends from the fourth Thursday in September to the third Wednesday in June. The best facilities are afforded for the acquisition of the Modern Languages and Music. The French Language is spoken in the family. Reference is made to the following gentlemen, whose daughters have been educated in the School:

Mr. JOHN F. BUTTERWORTH, New York.
 Mr. GEORGE F. CLARK, do.
 Mr. EFFINGHAM COCK, do.
 Capt. JOSEPH J. COMSTOCK, do.
 Mr. JOHN B. DICKINSON, do.
 Rev. CYRUS D. FOSS, do.
 Rev. R. S. FOSTER, D. D., do.
 Rev. GEO. S. HARE, D. D., do.
 Mr. CHARLES G. HARMER, do.
 Mr. CHARLES G. JUDSON, do.
 Mr. WILLIAM LECONEY, do.
 EDWARD VANDERPOEL, M. D., do.
 Mr. ABRAHAM H. CARDOZA, do.
 Prof. HARVEY B. LANE, do.
 Mr. THEODORE MCNAMEE, do.
 Mr. SAMUEL PERRY, do.
 ALFRED S. PURDY, M. D., do.
 Col. C. SCHWARZWAEDE, do.
 Mr. BENJAMIN J. BRADLEY, Lyons, N. Y.
 Mr. LEVI H. BRIGHAM, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 WILLIAM BURKITT, M. D., Keokuk, Iowa.
 Rev. F. E. CLARK, D. D., Greenwich, Ct.
 Rev. B. W. DWIGHT, LL. D., Clinton, N. Y.
 Mr. HENRY H. HATHORN, Saratoga Springs.
 Mr. C. C. NORTH, Sing Sing, N. Y.
 Judge MONCRIEF, New York.
 Rev. WM. G. T. SHEDD, D. D., New York.
 Rev. J. RALSTON SMITH, D. D., do.
 Rev. JOHN GRAEF BARTON, Professor in
 College of New York.
 Gen. CLINTON B. FISK, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. CHARLES F. DEEMS, D. D., New York.
 C. R. DISOSWAY, Esq., do.
 Rev. EDWIN F. HATFIELD, D. D., do.
 Hon. HENRY J. RAYMOND, do.
 Rev. ABEL STEVENS, LL. D., do.
 Mr. JAMES BEATTY, do.
 Rev. JOHN M. STEVENSON, D. D., do.
 Judge SIDNEY HUBBELL, Davenport, Iowa.
 Mr. AARON HEALY, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Col. A. D. HOPE, Somerville, N. J.
 GEO. P. NELSON, Esq., Scarsdale, N. Y.
 CHARLES H. QUINLAN, M. D., Lake Forest,
 Ill.
 Mr. E. V. ROBBINS, Chicago.
 Mr. AUGUSTUS F. SCOFIELD, Walden,
 N. Y.
 Mr. EDWARD F. STEWART, Easton, Pa.
 Mr. OSCAR F. AVERY, Chicago.
 Hon. JAMES BISHOP, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Mr. THOMAS W. CHACE, Providence, R. I.
 Mr. ORINGTON LUNT, Chicago.
 Rev. JOHN MCCLINTOCK, D. D., LL. D.,
 Madison, N. J.
 Mr. HENRY MILLER, Sacramento, Cal.
 Rev. JOHN F. MESSICK, D. D., Somerville,
 N. J.
 Rev. JOEL PARKER, D. D., Newark, N. J.
 Rev. ASA D. SMITH, D. D., Pres. of Dart-
 mouth Col.
 Rev. Bishop THOMSON, D. D., Chicago.
 Hon. MOSES MACDONALD, Portland, Me.

For full information, see circular, for which address as above.

Rev. D. C. VAN NORMAN, LL. D.,
 Principal.

SECURITY

Life Insurance and Annuity Company,

Nos. 31 & 33 Pine Street, New York.

Assets. - - \$1,500,000. Income. - - \$900,000.

Number of policies issued from Jan. 1st, 1867, to Jan. 1st, 1868, 4,110, insuring \$9,235,775. This Company issues *Life, Non-Forfeiture, in Ten Payments, Endowment, and Annuity Policies* on the most favorable terms.

One-third of the premium will be indorsed on the Policy as a Loan, at six per cent. interest, if desired. Dividends are declared annually after three years. Premiums can be paid annually, semi-annually, or quarterly. All Policies are *Non-Forfeiting* after three annual Premiums have been paid in Cash. Competent Solicitors liberally dealt with on application to our

OFFICERS:

ROBERT L. CASE, President.

THEO. R. WETMORE, Vice-Prest. ISAAC H. ALLEN, Secretary.

GENERAL AGENTS.

J. W. FLETCHER, Esq., for New England and New York State, 22 School Street, Boston, Mass.	
C. H. BAKER, Esq., for Illinois, Chicago, Ill.	
JOHN A. GORDON, Esq., for Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.	
F. B. TRAYER, Esq., for Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.	
J. L. DAYMUE, Esq., for Iowa, Davenport, Iowa.	
MARCY WINKLER & REHN, for Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.	
W. W. NORTHRUP, Esq., for Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind.	
JACOB HEATON, Esq., Cleveland, Ohio.	
NEWKIRK & MILTENBERGER, Columbus, Ohio.	
Wm. H. MURPHY, Esq., Cincinnati, Ohio.	
E. MEMMORE, Esq., Minerva, Ohio.	
M. E. ROBINSON, Esq., Salem, Ohio.	
FLORENCE KRAMER, Pittsburg, Pa.	
ERRA WILLIAMS, 525 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.	
G. W. S. HALL, 65 Second Street, Baltimore, Md.	

A. F. HASTINGS,
President.

W. B. BUCKHOUT,
Vice-Prest.

FRANK W. BALLARD,
Secretary.

NATHAN HARPER,
Asst Sec'y.

SECURITY INSURANCE COMPANY.

OFFICE, 119 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

CASH CAPITAL, - - - - \$1,000,000 00

ASSETS, January 1st, 1868, - - - \$1,477,677 12

Assets, January 1st, 1868.

Cash on Hand and in Bank,.....	\$ 96,412 95
Cash in Hands of Agents, and in course of transmission,.....	172,544 10
Bonds and Mortgages (on property worth \$1,136,500 00),.....	458,684 00
United States, State, and City Stocks, market value,.....	379,675 00
Call Loans on Government Collaterals,.....	145,500 00
Salvages, Accrued Interest, Re-Insurance Claims, Bills Receivable, and Unpaid Premiums,.....	92,565 27
All other Property,.....	132,295 80
	\$1,477,677 12
Liabilities,.....	\$100,626 71.

FIRE AND INLAND INSURANCE.

[ENGLAND.]

BATH HOTEL,

PICCADILLY, LONDON.

PARLORS

Have the cheerful view of Piccadilly, and

BEDROOMS

Overlook the Green Park.

Brunswick Hotel,

JERMYN STREET, ST. JAMES,

(UNDER ENTIRELY NEW MANAGEMENT)

LARGE AND SMALL SUITES OF APARTMENTS

AND COMFORTABLE BEDROOMS.

The above Hotels, situated in the centre of the West End, are replete with every convenience, and conducted with the comforts of home. Families and gentlemen boarded on moderate terms.

Messrs. BINGLEY & CO.,

Proprietors.

JOHN ARTHUR & CO.,

AGENTS TO THE BRITISH AND AMERICAN EMBASSIES,

BANK AND EXCHANGE OFFICE,

House, Estate, and General Commission Agents, and Wine Merchants,

10 Rue Castiglione, Paris.**Successor to his Father—Established 30 Years.**

Messrs. JOHN ARTHUR & CO. beg to call the attention of the Nobility and Gentry visiting Paris and the Continent, to the advantages afforded by the following branches of their Establishment:

BANK AND EXCHANGE.

Checks on the various Banks of Great Britain cashed on presentation, at the highest premium, thus avoiding the inconvenience of carrying Circular and other Notes, the usual Bankers' Commission not being charged. Accounts Current allowed and interest granted on Deposits. Letters of Credit given for India, China, and the Continent. Sales and purchases of public securities effected.

HOUSE AND ESTATE AGENCY.

Furnished and Unfurnished Houses, and apartments of every description procured in Paris, its Environs, or any part of France, without any expense to the Tenant. Estates Bought and Sold. Temporary or other accommodations secured in the best Hotels by advising the Firm.

COMMISSION AGENCY.

Every description of Merchandise, Furniture, Works of Art, Bronzes, &c., obtained at the trade price, thus saving the buyer from 20 to 30 per cent.

FOREIGN AND FRENCH WINES.

The extensive stock of JOHN ARTHUR & CO., formed during the last thirty years, enables them to supply Wines of the finest quality on most moderate charges. Wines in Cask or Bottle forwarded to all parts. Goods Forwarded or Warehoused. Parcels sent daily from Paris to London for three francs and upward. Letters and parcels may be addressed to the care of the above Firm till called for. No expenses incurred for agency. All information gratis.

JOHN ARTHUR & CO.,

ESTABLISHED THIRTY YEARS,

10. Rue Castiglione. 10.

Capital, - - - - - \$2,000,000.

THE
NATIONAL PARK BANK,
OF NEW YORK.

W. K. KITCHEN, President.

J. L. WORTH, Cashier.

SURPLUS, - - - \$1,400,000.

This Bank offers its services to Banks, Bankers, Incorporations, Merchants, and individuals generally, as their Fiscal Agent in New York for the transaction of all ordinary banking business, including the buying and selling of Government and other Securities.

With one or more correspondents in every city in the Union, its facilities for the making of collections are unrivalled, and its terms extremely favorable.

ÆTNA

Life Insurance Company.

CAPITAL STOCK AND SURPLUS

OVER

\$ 8,000,000.

Officers and Directors:

E. A. Bulkeley,	Leverett Brainard,
Austin Dunham,	Robert E. Day,
Gurdon W. Russell,	Daniel W. Norton,
Timothy M. Allyn,	Thomas K. Brace,
Appleton R. Hillyer.	

E. A. BULKELEY, PRESIDENT.

AUSTIN DUNHAM, VICE-PRESIDENT.

T. O. ENDERS, SECRETARY.

GURDON W. RUSSELL, M. D.,

Medical Examiner and Consulting Physician.

Pamphlets containing rates of premium and information on the subject of Life Insurance may be obtained at the office of the Company or from any of its Agents.

Agencies of the Company can be obtained by applying at the office, either personally or by letter.

PHŒNIX

Mutual Life Insurance Co.

OF

HARTFORD, CONN.

Dividends paid in 1865	- - - - -	50 per cent.
Dividends paid in 1866	- - - - -	50 per cent.
Dividends paid in 1867	- - - - -	50 per cent.
Dividends being paid in 1868	- - - - -	50 per cent.

The "PHŒNIX MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY" invite attention to the following plans peculiar to itself:—

- 1st.—All the advantages of an all cash and half note company.
- 2d.—If a party insures to-day for \$5,000, and pays one-half cash and one-half note (on any table), and should die to-morrow, next week, next month, or next year, the full amount of the policy is paid—\$5,000—and *no deductions of Note*. All notes returned as dividends, and never but four notes on any table. If the payment is made *all cash*, the assured receives *in cash* the amount, \$5,000, with dividends—*cash added*.
- 3d.—No restriction on employment.
- 4th.—The insured are permitted to travel or reside in any part of the United States, Europe, and the southern portion of South America, during any and all seasons of the year, free of charge. This has never before been offered by any Company of its age without an extra charge varying from \$10 to \$50 for every thousand dollars insured.
- 5th.—Dividends in the Phoenix have been, are now, 50 per cent.
- 6th.—The dividend is 50 per cent. on all its tables. If the annual premium is \$100, the dividend is \$50.
- 7th.—It usually pays its losses in the State in ten days from proof of claim.
- 8th.—All its policies are non-forfeiting; thereby no possible chance of loss to the insured.
- 9th.—Ordinary life policies non-forfeiting after three payments, while the policy is in force for the full amount of *even dollars of premiums paid*, besides many other great advantages. The Phoenix has paid to widows and orphans over \$725,000, and never contested a single claim; and has over \$2,250,000 safely secured for like purposes.
- 10th.—Its losses have been met by the annual interest received alone, and a surplus of interest left over to swell the general fund belonging to the insured.
- 11th.—Its rates of assurance are as cheap as any Company doing a *SAFE* business.
- 12th.—It *WILL NOT INSURE AN UNSOUND LIFE*.

Number of Policies issued during the year ending Dec. 31, 1867.....	5,811
Amount insured during the year.....	\$15,250,910
Total amount of losses paid.....	\$30,500

EDSON FESSENDEN,
President.

JAMES F. BURNS,
Secretary.

PROVIDENT Life Insurance and Investment Co.

~~~~~  
*CHARTER PERPETUAL.*  
~~~~~

CAPITAL, - - - - - \$1,000,000.

Office.—MASONIC TEMPLE, DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

LIFE INSURANCE AND INSURANCE AGAINST ACCIDENTS.

OFFICERS.

IRA Y. MUNN,.....President.
H. E. SARGENT,.....Vice-President.
C. HOLLAND,.....Secretary.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

GEORGE P. HARDING, F. H. WINSTON, WILLIAM H. BAND.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

IRA Y. MUNN,.....Commission Merchant.
GEO. F. HARDING,.....Attorney at Law.
H. E. SARGENT,.....General Superintendent Michigan Central Railroad.
F. H. WINSTON,.....Attorney at Law.
MATTHEW LAFLIN,.....Capitalist.
T. B. BLACKSTONE,.....President Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company.
C. HOLLAND,.....Secretary.
WILLIAM H. BAND,.....Chicago Tribune Company.
SAMUEL HALE,.....Firm of Hale & Ayer, Iron Merchants.
WM. H. FERRY,.....Acting Director Chicago and Northwestern Railroad Company.
DANIEL THOMPSON,.....Commission Merchant and Superintendent City Railway Co.
JOHN T. LINDSAY,.....Attorney at Law, Peoria.

ÆTNA INSURANCE COMPANY

OF

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.

CAPITAL * * * * * \$3,000,000

Cash assets over.....\$4,000,000 00

Losses paid in forty-seven years.....19,127,410 06

LUCIUS J. HENDEE, President.

J. GOODNOW, Secretary.

J. B. BENNETT, General Agent. Branch, 171 Vine street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. A. WILLIAMS, General Agent for New England. Office, Providence, R. I.

CAPT. E. P. DORE, Superintendent Inland Department: Buffalo, N. Y.

Fire and Inland Navigation Policies issued at the Agencies of this Company, on terms adapted to the hazard and consistent with a fair profit.

HOPE

Fire Insurance Company,

92 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

CASH CAPITAL, - - - \$150,000
NET SURPLUS, March 1, 1868, - 53,392

JAMES E. MOORE,

SECRETARY.

JACOB REESE,

PRESIDENT

ENGRAVING.

The undersigned, having had eighteen years' practical experience in ENGRAVING, desires to call the attention of the Ladies and Gentlemen of this city, and strangers sojourning, to this most important fact, viz.:

THAT A JUST EQUIVALENT FOR THEIR MONEY

can only be had at the hands of those who do the work, and that none but

PRACTICAL ARTISTS

can do justice to their wants, for the simple reason that others can not comprehend THEIR TASTE, having no knowledge of the art, and scarcely any other desire than to get their money.

Among his patrons will be found Ladies and Gentlemen of the highest order of culture and taste in this city.

PARIS AND LONDON STYLES

engraved from specimens submitted for choice, and full satisfaction guaranteed.

DIPLOMAS FOR COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES

engraved in elegant style, and specimens furnished to those who wish to see them.

STAMPING IN COLORS EXECUTED IN THE BEST MANNER.

JAMES McLEES,

PRACTICAL ENGRAVER, 609 Broadway, N. Y.

PROPOSALS FOR \$800,000

OF

New York County Court-House Stock, No. 2.

Scaled proposals will be received at the Comptroller's Office until Tuesday, June 23, 1868, at 2 o'clock, P. M., when the same will be publicly opened, for the whole or any part of the sum of eight hundred thousand dollars of "The New York County Court-House Stock, No. 2," authorized by chapter 854 of the Laws of 1868, and by an ordinance of the Board of Supervisors, approved by the Mayor, June 11, 1868. The said Stock is to provide additional means for the completion, fitting up and furnishing of the New County Court-House, on Chambers Street. It will bear interest at the rate of six per cent. per Annum, payable semi-annually, on the first day of May and November in each year, and the principal will be redeemed in successive annual instalments of one hundred and sixty thousand dollars each, commencing on the first day of November, in the year eighteen hundred and seventy-seven.

The proposals will state the amount of Stock desired, and the price per hundred dollars thereof, and the person whose proposals are accepted will thereupon be required to deposit with the County Treasurer the sums awarded to them respectively.

On presenting to the Comptroller the receipts of the County Treasurer for such deposits the parties will be entitled to receive certificates for equal amounts of the par value of the sums awarded to them, bearing interest from the dates of payments.

Each proposal should be sealed and endorsed, "Proposals for New York County Court-House Stock, No. 2," and enclosed in a second envelope, addressed to the Comptroller.

The right is reserved to reject any or all of the bids if the interests of the county require it.

RICHARD B. CONNOLLY, Comptroller.

CITY OF NEW YORK, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, }
COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE, June 11, 1868. }

Charter Oak Life Insurance Co.,

HARTFORD, CONN.

Assets, April, 1868, - - - **\$4,115,932.57**
Annual Income, - - - **over 2,500,000.00**

ANNUAL DIVIDENDS. DIVIDENDS GUARANTEED.

Policies Issued, over 31,000. Losses Paid, \$1,449,696.52.
Dividends Paid, over \$1,109,418.89.

Those intending to obtain Insurance, are urged to consult our Agents, and examine the merits of this Company.

JAMES C. WALKLEY, PRESIDENT.

S. J. BESTOR, ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

NOYES S. PALMER, VICE PRESIDENT.

HENRY M. PALMER, SUPT. OF AGENCIES.

S. H. WHITE, SECRETARY.

L. W. MEECH, MATHEMATICIAN.

J. T. POMPILLY, General Agent for New York City and Brooklyn.

Office, 151 Broadway, New York.

THE North American Life and Accident INSURANCE COMPANY,

General Office, 432 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

CAPITAL, - - - \$500,000.

This Company insures against **DEATH** from any cause, with or without indemnity for **disability** resulting from **accident**.

The rates are exceedingly low, as compared with other companies.

All Policies are non-forfeitable except for fraud.

All Policies are payable at death, or 80 years of age.

The Company is doing business in New England, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Arkansas and Tennessee; and persons desiring Life or Accident Insurance, are respectfully referred to our numerous Agents in those States.

S. P. DARLINGTON,
Secretary.

LEWIS L. HOUP,
President.

PROPOSALS
FOR
Materials to be Supplied to the Navy Yards
UNDER THE COGNIZANCE OF THE
Bureau of Construction and Repair.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR, }
WASHINGTON, D. C., May 22, 1868.

Sealed Proposals to furnish Timber and other Materials for the Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1869, will be received at this Bureau until 12 o'clock, M., of the 24th of June next, at which time the proposals will be opened.

The proposals must be addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, Navy Department, Washington, and must be endorsed "Proposals for Timber, &c., for the Navy," that they may be distinguished from other business letters.

Printed schedules for such classes as parties deal in and intend to bid for, together with instructions to bidders giving the forms of proposal, of guarantee, and of certificate of guarantors, with printed forms of offers, will be furnished to such persons as desire to bid, on application to the Commandants of the respective Navy Yards, and those of all the Yards on application to the Bureau.

The Commandant of each Navy Yard and the Purchasing Paymaster for each station, will have a copy of the schedules of the other Yards, for examination only, in order that persons who intend to bid may judge whether it is desirable to make application for any of the classes of those Yards.

The proposal must be for the whole of a class, and all applications for information, or for the examination of samples, must be made to the commandants of the respective yards.

6

